

X-18421

UCSB LIBRARY



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

THE EXPOSITOR.

VOL. V.

List of Contributors to Volume V.

- REV. JOSEPH AGAR BEET, D.D.
E. N. BENNETT, M.A.
REV. PROF. W. H. BENNETT, M.A.
REV. A. A. BURD, M.A.
RIGHT. REV. G. A. CHADWICK, D.D., Lord
Bishop of Derry and Raphoe.
REV. PROF. T. K. CHEYNE, D.D.
F. C. CONYBEARE, M.A.
THE LATE REV. R. W. DALE, D.D., LL.D.
REV. PROF. MARCUS DODS, D.D.
REV. A. M. FAIRBAIRN, D.D., LL.D.
REV. PROF. R. A. FALCONER, D.D.
REV. PROF. G. G. FINDLAY, M.A.
PROF. J. RENDEL HARRIS, M.A.
W. R. INGE, M.A.
REV. PROF. E. KÖNIG, D.D.
REV. G. MARGOLIOUTH, M.A.
REV. G. MATHESON, M.A, D.D., F.R.S.E.
REV. J. B. MAYOR, M.A.
REV. PROF. TH. NÖLDEKE, D.D.
REV. PROF. JAMES ORR, D.D.
PROF. W. M. RAMSAY, D.C.L., LL.D.
REV. PROF. A. ROBERTS, D.D.
REV. PROF. J. A. ROBINSON, D.D.
REV. D. M. ROSS, M.A.
REV. JAMES STALKER, D.D.
REV. H. CLAY TRUMBULL, D.D.
REV. J. H. WILKINSON, M.A.

THE
EXPOSITOR.

EDITED BY THE REV.

W. ROBERTSON NICOLL, M.A., LL.D.

FIFTH SERIES.

Volume V.

London :
HODDER AND STOUGHTON,
27, PATERNOSTER ROW.

MDCCCXCVII.

BUTLER & TANNER,
THE SELWOOD PRINTING WORKS,
FROME, AND LONDON.

“THE MIND OF THE MASTER.”

THIS is a superficially attractive and a deeply disappointing book. It has such gift of phrase that one thinks it might easily have been a work of art, but it is not. And it has such flashes of insight that one looks to it for fresh and real teaching, but gets nothing of the sort. Let us linger for a moment with the style, meaning thereby the expression of thought, and not such slips as that by which in the first sentence of chapter viii. a verb is left without a nominative.

There is an unpleasant flavour of Renan, in his most sugary mood, in the expression which tells us about Jesus “in a moment of fine inspiration” (p. 117). Of course, if this expresses Dr. Watson’s settled opinion, it is not with the style that we must quarrel. But if he believes (as we gladly think he does) that the Spirit in His organic completeness “abode upon” Jesus, that the words which He spake were not His own, but as He heard He spoke; that as long as He was in the world He was the light of the world; that He whom God sent spoke the words of God because God gave not the Spirit unto Him by measure; that He was one with His discourse (Σὺ τίς εἶ; . . . Τὴν ἀρχὴν ὁ, τι καὶ λαλῶ ὑμῖν, John viii. 25), being Himself the Word, the Truth, and the true Light,—in that case, to speak of “moments of fine inspiration,” as if inspiration ebbed and flowed in the breast of Jesus, is not only nonsense, but very mischievous nonsense indeed. What is in question is not the κένωσις, but the efficient equipment of the Logos. It is our hope that such expressions (and we shall find many such) do not indicate erroneous doctrine, but only defective grasp on doctrine; that they are the utterance of a man of

letters moving about in the world unrecognised of theology, and that the handwriting is uncertain because the pen is in an unsteady grasp.

Here is a good specimen of theology unrecognised:—"When one says 'I believe' in the Nicene Creed, he means that he assents to the theological statement" (p. 152). He neither says nor means anything of the sort: what he declares is belief in the God of whom the formula is predicated, and he dwells on the formula only because it defines and clears his conception of the God whom he says that "I believe in." The belief which the Nicene Creed requires is exactly that "faith," with which Dr. Watson contrasts it. But one is greatly helped to disparage the creeds by ignoring their exact contents.

And here, again, is a curious specimen of unsteadiness of the pen. In one place we read that "a prophet has many things to say to his generation; one only is his message. Jesus treated every idea of the first order in the sphere of religion; His burden was Life" (p. 67). But again we are told that "every prophet of the first order has his own message, and it crystalises into a favourite idea. . . . With the Master, it was the Kingdom of God" (p. 319). How in the name of reason are these two assertions to be reconciled?

Here is another specimen of inadequate and evasive thinking. "Jesus never succeeded in public save once, when He was crucified: He never failed in private save once, with Pontius Pilate" (p. 110). As if Jesus had no private intercourse with Iscariot. But what is Dr. Watson's notion of success? If he means lasting and solid effect, then all the public words and works of Jesus, from the Sermon on the Mount to His defiance of the High Priest, are a success prodigious and eternal. If he means immediate and apparent success, then the Cross consummated the failure of the life of Jesus.

We do not want *mots* upon this grave subject, we want real helps to insight, and this is a *mot* which ceases to impose the moment we examine it, an epigram which attracts us only while we half think.

The Church, he says, "Jesus only mentions once" (p. 320). He is wrong (Matt. xvi. 18; xviii. 17 *bis*); but the fact that Jesus only twice named it thus is rather an evidence that He had some other name for it than the reverse. It increases the probability of what the author apparently denies, that the Church is the same as the Kingdom of God. "No natural reading of Church can include Plato; no natural reading of kingdom can exclude him. The effect of the two institutions upon the world is a contrast" (pp. 321, 322). But why does the author speak elsewhere of these two institutions as identical, "that unique society which He called the Kingdom of God, and we prefer to call the Church" (p. 14)? For him, by the way, that kingdom is "Utopia," and the regeneration is "Utopia" also (pp. 58, 319).

Still confining ourselves to style, we fancy—but this may be only Anglican prejudice—that we detect a bathos in the following words: "When Traditionalism has the upper hand, it burns its opponents as Rome did John Huss, or annoys them as the Church of England did Robertson of Brighton" (p. 11).

Alas for the martyr who was burned! And alas for that other martyr who was "annoyed," if not by the Church of England (which was otherwise engaged), at least by some elderly folk in Brighton!

Again, what is to be said of the good taste or decency of such an utterance as this: "Spiritual statistics are unknown in the Gospels; they came in with St. Peter in the pardonable intoxication of success: they have since grown to be a mania" (p. 110)? Poor St. Peter! Are we then to suppose that his head was turned on the day when he was

baptized with the Holy Ghost,—that it was he who reckoned the three thousand (perhaps while preaching), and in a fit of conceit informed St. Luke of the fine result of his great sermon? And yet we seem to remember earlier statistics, and that his Master, as an incentive to faith, reminded the Twelve of the five thousand and the four thousand; of how many loaves fed them, and how many baskets full they gathered up.

We pass from the style to the substance of this book. What kind of teaching does it contain? We have hinted pretty broadly already our suspicion that the writer has not laid a firm grasp on any theory of the facts. And the reader will find it easier to believe this when he is shown, in one or two flagrant examples, with what sort of grasp on the narrative itself has Dr. Watson undertaken to expound, for us, the Mind of the Master.

Take then the following narrative, for a certain abruptness in which we are not accountable, but only for the italics. "‘If Thou wilt, Thou canst make me clean.’ Of course, I am willing, said Jesus, *and referred the man back to his inalienable human rights*" (p. 94). Unfortunately, this reference back is not produced, and indeed nothing of the kind ever happened. What we read is that Jesus said "I will" (and added, as a result of His own volition), "be thou clean," but, as to inalienable human rights, in the Mind of the Master man was a debtor who might be sold into slavery, a prodigal without hope except from his father's mercy.

One is half ashamed to say where he suspects that Dr. Watson got this strange theory and stranger story. There is a dim resemblance to it in the answer of Jesus, not given to a sufferer asking for his own cleansing, but to an agonized father whose child the disciples could not cure. He did on that occasion say that all things were possible,—not to humanity, by virtue of its inherent rights,

but to faith. He said it, not because the suppliant was ignorant of the rights of humanity, but because he was distrustful of the Good Physician. "If Thou canst do anything," said the man. "If thou canst," said Jesus, "all things are possible to him that believeth." And we are well informed, by many passages, that the faith which He required was not confidence in one's inalienable rights; it was reliance upon the ability and heart of a benefactor. His question was, "Believest thou that I am able to do this?" The great faith of the Canaanite was not proved by reliance on the inalienable rights of humanity, but by accepting a place with the dogs under the table.

Here is another specimen of the same inaccuracy: "When He said, 'Believe in Me,' 'Carry My Cross,' was He not calling men to fulfil His gospel?" (pp. 19, 20). But Jesus never said to any man, "Carry My Cross," and perhaps no one ever claimed to do so until now. Certainly the inspired writers attached such a sacredness to the Cross of Jesus, that, despite the example of their Master, they never ventured to describe their own sufferings by the name of a cross at all.¹ And yet St. Paul spoke of filling up what was left over of the suffering of his Master, and Jesus spoke of drinking from His cup, and being baptized with His baptism. But of sharing His Cross, never. That He bade His disciples to take up some cross is attested by two passages in each of the Synoptic Gospels, one of which, however (Mark x. 21), is unquestionably spurious. Not one of the remaining five considers that the phrase *τὸν σταυρὸν* guards sufficiently well against the misinterpretation *τὸν σταυρὸν μου*. In four of them it is *τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ*, and in the other, still more emphatically, it is *τὸν σταυρὸν ἑαυτοῦ*.

¹ Gal. ii. 20: "I have been crucified with Christ," has no bearing on the matter in hand, which would require the present tense: I am, by daily suffering, in the process of being crucified.

I do not stop to ask now what the meaning of this significant fact may be: it is enough to point out that for Dr. Watson's assertion (the foundation of a most important argument)—the assertion, namely, that Jesus said, "Carry My Cross"—there is no justification whatsoever. He guarded Himself well against any such misunderstanding (Matt. x. 38, xvi. 24; Mark viii. 34; Luke ix. 23, xiv. 27).

And yet how much is presently built upon this gratuitous, reiterated blunder. "Jesus did not describe His Cross as a satisfaction to God, else He had scarcely asked His disciples to share it" (p. 120); "Jesus nowhere commanded that one cling to His Cross: He everywhere commanded that one carry His Cross" (p. 128). It is of the Cross, thus misunderstood, that we read, not without pain, "the action of the Cross on sin is as simple in its higher sphere as the reduction of fever by antipyrine" (pp. 121, 122). But perhaps he is not the best physician, for body or soul, who professes to find no mystery in the action of remedy upon disease. At all events we repeat that Jesus does not utter anywhere the precept, said to be "everywhere," upon which all this is based. Now, just as you cannot botanize by trampling down the flower beds, so it is of little use to theorize boldly about facts which one is walking over instead of carefully observing,—unless indeed one accepts the wonderful dictum, which explains so much of this book, that "we have an intuition of Jesus. *He is not a subject of study*, He is a revelation to the soul: that or nothing" (p. 50). As if a revelation from God were not to be studied. As if the prophets did not search and inquire diligently.

But this reminds us that, in the language of this book, the prophets are discoverers. "Their chief discovery was the character of God—when the Hebrew conscience . . . lifted the veil from the Eternal, and conceived Jehovah as the impersonation of Righteousness" (p. 113). In another passage we are told how they achieved this exploit; Jewish

piety "imagined" the austere holiness of God, it "added" His tenderness; the saints "infused the idea with passion," they "assigned" to Him human emotions; they "are unapproachable in their familiarity" (pp. 255, 256).

And, of course, since it is they who have done all this, we are quite as much indebted to them as Dr. Watson says, who tells us that they laid the world under a priceless obligation. But we have been accustomed to think that it was a more awful Hand than theirs which, while they covered their eyes, "lifted the veil from the Eternal."

Again, "His disciples were to use no kind of force, neither tradition, *nor miracles*, nor the sword, nor money. They were to live as He lived" (p. 57). Does this really mean that He worked no miracles, and that He did not say, "If I had not done among them the works that none other man did, they had not had sin?" Does it mean that He did not bid them, "heal the sick, cast out devils," nor say, "These signs shall follow them that believe," nor again, "Greater works than these shall ye do, because I go unto My Father"? If not this, does it mean anything?

In another passage, the resurrection of Jesus is hopelessly confused with the immortality of His spirit.

"Was this Life something that could be quenched by death or that death could touch? Granted that they scourged and crucified Jesus' body, that it died and was buried. Could Jesus, who gave the Sermon on the Mount and the discourse in the upper room, who satisfied St. John and loosed St. Mary Magdalene from her sin, and who remains the unapproachable ideal of perfection, be annihilated by a few nails and the thrust of a Roman spear? If the lowest form of energy, however it may be transformed or degraded, be still conserved in some shape and place, can any one believe that the Author of Life in this world was extinguished on a Roman cross? The certainty of Jesus' resurrection does not rest in the last issue on His

isolated appearances during the forty days ; it rests on His Life for thirty-three years. His Life was beyond the reach of death ; it was Ageless Life " (pp. 82, 83).

But this is not the doctrine of any resurrection at all. In every shape in which that doctrine is not explained away, it affirms the redress of death which has occurred, not the impossibility that it ever should occur. When the Church of Christ professes her faith in His resurrection, she means the resurrection of His Body, which was so far from being "beyond the reach of death" that, as she affirms, "it was crucified, dead, and buried." When Jesus Himself predicted the future suffering of the Son of Man, He did not say that He was "beyond the reach of death"; He said exactly the reverse, "They shall kill Him, and the third day He shall rise again." And the citadel of the faith will be surrendered when the Church accepts this new gospel that it was impossible for Christ to share our death, and so make us partakers of His immortality, instead of the old gospel, "that He tasted death for every man," that He hath been raised from out of the dead, "the firstfruit of them that slept." "We are baptized into His death," said Paul; "He is alive because He could not die," says Dr. Watson.

In reliance upon this strange confusion of ideas, he relinquishes, at least for the homely Christian, not only the real doctrine of the resurrection of the Body of Jesus, but also, quite formally, the evidence by which it is established. "How can one be certain that Jesus is with God? It is a question of the last importance. There are four lines of proof. The first is to cite reliable evidence that Jesus rose from Joseph's tomb—this is for a lawyer. The second is historical—the existence of the Christian Church—this is for a scholar. The third is mystical—the experience of Christians—this is for a saint. The fourth is ethical—the nature of Jesus' life—this is for every one.

The last is the most akin to the mind of Jesus, who was accustomed to insist upon the self-evidencing power of His life. He is alive because He could not die. 'I am the Resurrection and the Life'" (p. 81). But if the only evidence (except for lawyers, scholars, and saints) only proves the impossibility that Christ should die, it certainly follows that there is no evidence for the life of that which actually died.

Again, "Jesus cast His whole doctrine of sin into the drama of the Prodigal Son. . . . The parable moves between the two poles of ideal and real human life—home, where the sons of God live in moral harmony with their Father, which is liberty; and exile, where they live in riotous disobedience, which is license. He fixes on His representative sinners," etc. (p. 102). This reading of the parable entirely overlooks the fact that the son who remained at home was quite out of harmony with his father; of all the plenty of that mansion he never really enjoyed a kid, and his secret friends were those with whom he could not there make merry.

In the same connection, and still as a part of the teaching of Jesus, he tells us that "each man carried his heaven in his heart—"the kingdom is within you"; or his hell in a gnawing remorse and heat of lust, 'where their worm dieth not, and their fire is not quenched'" (p. 103). One may not deny that the germs of heaven and hell are even now within the saint and the sinner. But it is quite certain that our Lord never used these words "heaven" and "hell" of the present time. "The kingdom of heaven" does not mean heaven; hell is a place where, after death, the rich man lifted up his eyes, and into which the sinner, with hands and eyes which misled him, is finally "cast."

When we read that Jesus "had moods" and "sometimes lost heart" (p. 240), that He "rested His own Sonship on community of character" (p. 262), and not His

community of character upon His Sonship; and that He "pursued with bitter mocking" those of whom He disapproved, we are forced to ask whether the theology of Dr. Watson is really represented by these passages, or by others which seem to contradict them; and, it must be added, we are again reminded very painfully of M. Renan. And what is the meaning of the sinister phrase, "*Jesus assumed existence* [in another world] for all, but existence on this low plane of death was not worth His consideration. *Jesus was not an authority on existence*" (p. 72). What it seems to mean is that Jesus did not believe in the annihilation of the wicked, but that His opinion does not greatly matter.

In a study of the Mind of the Master one looks for some light upon the two symbolical actions which He bequeathed to His Church. And, as usual, Dr. Watson finds them very simple indeed, as a skater thinks the water shallow into which he does not plunge. "Each was perfect in its simplicity, a beautiful poem" (p. 333). Yes, but what are these poems about? "One was Baptism, where the candidate for God's kingdom disappeared into water and appeared again with a new name. This meant that he had died to self and risen a new creature, the child of the divine will" (*ibid.*). The incessant doctrine of Scripture is that "We are baptized into Christ's death, . . . buried with Christ in baptism," but here we have, perhaps for the first time in the long history of the church, a formal statement and explanation of the rite, in which Christ—not to say the death of Christ—is never mentioned.

"The other was the Lord's Supper, where Jesus' disciple eats bread and drinks wine in remembrance of His death. This meant that he had entered into the spirit of his Master, and given himself to the service of the world" (*ibid.*). Not a word here about any Divine gift ("the Bread which I will give") nor about human reciprocity,

dependence, being fed. In a previous passage the author has examined Christ's discourse upon Himself as the Bread of Life, with the same resolute ignoring of its true meaning. "Community" is substituted for dependence (pp. 76, 77). But, really, it is useless to ask whether the commandment, "Take, eat," means that we "enter into" something, or that something enters into us.

Looking back over the ground which we have traversed, one is struck most of all by a single dominant characteristic. The prophets are discoverers of truth rather than recipients of a revelation. To be made whole is an inalienable human right. The Cross of Christ is no more than a cross which we can share, and expiation is no more than reconciliation. Baptism is only being baptized into a death of our own, and can be explained without mentioning Jesus at all. The Lord's Supper is a pledge, not of Christ given to us, but of ourselves given to the world. It is a supper without Bread.

A noble pattern, lofty teaching, and kindling of ardour by a great Leader—these we find. But the imparting from heaven of what we never could acquire, even when shown to us, the receiving into ourselves of a new humanity,—this is quite neglected, even where it is not inferentially denied. Christ is continually the Master; but the Saviour has disappeared. And yet, when one called Him a good Master, He refused to accept the adjective divorced from a more awful noun. When another confessed Him to be sent from God as a Teacher, He declared that instruction was nothing—"ye must be born again."

It is only with this deficiency noted and borne in mind, that one can examine aright the proposal in defence of which Dr. Watson puts forth all his power. That proposal is that we should withdraw the creeds of Christendom, and replace them by the Sermon on the Mount, which he is pleased to call a creed.

"Among all the creeds of Christendom, the only one which has the authority of Christ Himself is the Sermon on the Mount." "Imagine a body of Christians who should take their stand on the Sermon of Jesus, and conceive their creed on His lines." (This, by the way, assumes that the "Sermon" furnishes the lines on which Jesus would have constructed a creed.) "Who would refuse to sign this creed? They would come from the east and the west, and the north and the south, to its call" (pp. 15-21).

One would wrong Dr. Watson by assuming hereupon that he really wishes to brush aside as unimportant the Divinity of Jesus, the fact that He suffered (not to say that He redeemed us), possibly human immortality, and certainly the very existence of the Holy Spirit. On the contrary, he argues rightly that a unique position is claimed by Jesus when He "makes a most unqualified demand on the loyalty of His disciples, and believes that the attraction of His person will sustain their obedience" (p. 184). And it would be ungenerous to question the frankness of his allusions to the Divinity of Christ, although we think that his language is at times calculated to compromise that doctrine gravely.

But the question is not about any one's beliefs: it is about the effect of certain proposals. And we are quite sure that a Church with no creed but the Sermon on the Mount, and flooded, as he anticipates, by great multitudes whom such "liberty of thought" would attract, would neither bear witness to any definite doctrines, nor hold together for six months.

The futility of the proposal may indeed be proved out of his own mouth. "What one thinks to-day he will do to-morrow, and the first equipment for living is a creed" (p. 249).

Is then the Sermon on the Mount the adequate equip-

ment for Christian living? Does it convey the new motive power? "Before Jesus could utilize this love" of His disciples "He had to create it, and this was not accomplished either by His example or His teaching" (p. 189). It follows that it was not created by the Sermon on the Mount. It follows that the contents of that Sermon are not an adequate equipment for Christian living. But this is what, by his own showing, a creed must be. What, then, is the necessary supplement? "Give Me a Cross whereon to die," said Jesus, "and I will make thereof a throne from which to rule the world." . . . Jesus' imagination was powerfully affected . . . by the magnetic attraction of the Cross when He cried, "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto Me" (p. 190).

Quite so. And this is the reason why the Cross and its triumphant issue are the substance of the model creed given us by the great Apostle with remarkable formality, "I make known unto you, brethren, the gospel which I preached unto you, which also ye received, wherein also ye stand, by which also ye are saved." Well, what is it? Not a system of ethics; but the impelling force by which ethics may overcome sloth and self-indulgence and contempt of other men: "that Christ died for our sins, and that He was buried, and that He hath been raised" (1 Cor. xv. 1-3).

(We note in passing that St. Paul did not expect men to be saved by regarding the death of Jesus as "impossible.")

To make good the supreme claim of this so-called creed (which is yet a sermon), it is urged that "the teaching of Jesus must have a solitary value and authority" (p. 26). "Ought we to read St. Paul in the light of Jesus, or Jesus in the light of St. Paul? It is difficult to see how any one can hesitate in his reply, who believes either in the divinity of Jesus' person or in the divinity of His teaching" (p. 39).

These are brave words, but yet we venture to hesitate in our reply; or rather we reply, without hesitation, in the contrary direction from Dr. Watson. Jesus ought not to be the commentator on St. Paul, but St. Paul on Jesus: it is a high testimony to His supreme rank that inspired commentators, both before His incarnation and after His ascension, "spake of Him," and in the light of these we are surely meant to read Him.

Now it is a safe assertion that they all insist twenty times upon His suffering and ascension for once that they allude to His preaching.

Nay, Dr. Watson is himself our best evidence that it is no disrespect to Jesus to read Him in the light of the common instinct of all Christendom, which is not thinking of the Mount of the Sermon when it sings of the "green hill far away." "Whatever is said by St. Paul or St. John, by Augustine or Clement, so far as it conforms to type, may be assigned to Jesus, so that while He said little, if one goes by volume of speech, and wrote nothing, He has been speaking in every after age where any disciple has thought according to His mind. So it was right to say that Jesus gave the Evangel with His own lips,—right also to say that the Evangel has been continued by Him through other lips unto this present" (pp. 29, 30). Right also, we must urge, to find no disrespect to Jesus in valuing those truths which they "could not bear" while He was with them, but which He taught when the Spirit led them into all truth. Was St. Paul disrespectful to Jesus when he was "ever the reverent student and faithful expositor of the mind of Jesus declared to him by heaven and by the inner light"? (pp. 38, 39). How then can our employment of his revelation be a slight put upon his Master?

But even if we granted that our faith must rest upon words spoken by the lips of Jesus upon earth, Dr. Watson tells us that even of subjects which He treated on the

Mount, He "only concluded His treatment before His arrest in the garden" (p. 160), and He insists that St. Paul's treatment of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit is "not to be compared with the promise of the Comforter given in the upper room" (p. 33). Granted, but it follows that this doctrine at least in the Nicene Creed need not be surrendered by way of respect to the words of our Lord Himself. It is absent however from the Sermon on the Mount.

Dr. Watson urges that although "certainly Jesus did expound and amplify the principles of His first deliverance, there is no evidence that He altered the constitution of His kingdom, either by imposing fresh conditions or omitting the old" (p. 19). But He surely said, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His blood, ye have no life in yourselves." "The Son of Man must be lifted up, that whosoever believeth on Him may have eternal life." The time is definitely marked out for us when "Jesus began" to teach the doctrine of His suffering and death (Matt. xvi. 21), and if (which at least is surely "thinkable")—if the actions of Jesus were as great as His words, and if His supreme action was His exodus which He accomplished at Jerusalem, then it follows by a necessary consequence that the real import of His appearance among men could only be explained by His removal.

In truth there is no conflict whatever between the Sermon and these later sayings. They tell how life must be kindled; the Sermon tells in what directions it must exert its energies. The former is the very essence, the differentiating quality of our religion. Least of all should it be ignored by one who allows himself to say that "it is open to debate whether Jesus said anything absolutely new, save when He taught the individual to call God Father" (p. 50), and who is therefore reduced by the exigency of his position

to emaciate the creed of Christendom (as he would have it) until it has no more distinction than this: "Originality is not an addition to knowledge, it is only a new arrangement of colour" (p. 51).

If this is indeed all, one pities the apologists of the next century. And yet, perhaps, if this be all, their inevitable defeat need not concern us or them very sorely.

G.-A. DERRY AND RAPHOE.

CHRIST'S ATTITUDE TO HIS OWN DEATH.

III.

THE ministry in Jerusalem is the supreme moment in the history of Jesus, and we have therefore to inquire whether it reveals, and, if so, in what degree it defines, His idea as to His death. We must keep clearly in view the positive features in the situation: He comes to the Holy City, the heart of the religion, the home of the temple, the throne of the priesthood, the one place where sacrifices acceptable to God could be offered. He was under no illusion as to the fate that there awaited Him: the prophet could not perish out of Jerusalem.¹ Hither He came speaking and acting consciously as the Christ, with everything He was to do and suffer stamped by Him and for Himself with a distinct Messianic character. What now was the idea as to His work and fortunes as the Messiah which governed His consciousness? Let us attempt to discover it by an analysis of His words and acts.

I.

A. We begin with the triumphal entry. It can hardly be regarded as an accidental or even spontaneous outburst of popular enthusiasm. The Synoptists were agreed in

¹ Luke xiii. 33.

ascribing the initiative to Jesus; He sends for the ass and the ass's colt in order that He may fitly enter the Holy City,¹ and though John is less detailed he is almost as explicit.² The disciples read the command as a public assertion of His claim to Messianic dignity, and proceed to possess the multitude with their belief. And so Jesus is welcomed as the King come to claim His own by a jubilant people, crying, "Hosanna to the Son of David!" He does not rebuke their joy, or, as He had once done,³ enjoin silence as to His being the Christ, but accepts their homage as His rightful due. Hence when the Pharisees said, "Master, rebuke Thy disciples," He answered that, were they to be silent, the very stones would cry out.⁴ He thus endorses and vindicates their recognition. But He knows that while the people are trustful and waiting to be led, the rulers are suspicious and watching to crush the leader and—to fulfil His prophecy. For to subtle rulers nothing is so easy as to use a simple people as they will.

But for His judgment on these public events we must turn to words spoken in the intimacy of His immediate circle. On the morrow, as He returns to the city, He speaks the parable of the barren fig tree.⁵ It has a double moral, one pointed at the Jews, another at the disciples. The first tells how in the season of fruition He came to Israel, and instead of fruit "found nothing but leaves." And what was the good of the fruitless tree save to be bidden "to wither away"? The scribes, who ought to have been the eyes of the people, saw not the time of their visitation, saw only that their own custody of the parchment which held the oracles of God was threatened, and so they made the great refusal. The chief priests, who ought to have been the conscience of Israel, had no

¹ Matt. xxi. 1 ff.; Mark xi. 1 ff.; Luke xix. 29 ff.

² John xii. 14.

³ Matt. xvi. 20.

⁴ Luke xix. 40.

⁵ Matt. xxi. 18-22.

conscience toward God but only to themselves, and so they could think of nothing but the happiest expedient for effecting His death. So read, the parable is a piece of severe prophetic satire. The second moral told the disciples to have faith; with it they could accomplish anything, without it nothing at all. They were to be the antithesis to the rulers, and exemplify not a faithlessness which the world overcomes, but the faith which overcomes the world. The two combined show the twofold attitude of Jesus, on the one hand to the men who were to erect the cross, on the other to the men who were to preach in His name to all nations. What is significant is the place and function which the parable assigns to Himself: to fail to receive Him is fundamental failure; to believe in Him is to be qualified to effect the removal of mountains.

B. The immediate sequent of the entry must also be noted. Jesus went straight to the temple, where, Mark significantly says, "He looked round upon all things,"¹ and, returning on the morrow, "He cast out all them that bought and sold in the temple, and overthrew the tables of the money-changers, and the seats of them that sold doves."² This incident has been very variously judged: it has been regarded as an outbreak of passion, as a lawless act, as even an act of rebellion and revolution; as a desperate attempt to precipitate a conflict, and by a sort of surprise attack save Himself and defeat the priests and rulers.³ These seem to us shallow views. We could not feel as if Jesus became sinful simply because He was angry; nay, the more sinless we think Him to be the more do we conceive indignation and resentment as natural and even necessary to Him. There are acts and states that

¹ xi. 11. ² *Ib.* 15; Matt. xxi. 12.

³ Keim, *Jesus of Nazara*, vol. v., pp. 118-23, for example, speaks about "His uncurbed anger," "His passion for rule and revolution," and describes His action as the "Nothakt eines Untergehenden."

ought to provoke anger, and not to feel it would argue a singularly poor and obtuse moral nature, without any power of recoil from the offensive and reprehensible. And from what He saw in the temple Jesus did well to be angry, yet His anger was without passion. Matthew finely indicates this by two things, "the blind and the lame"—the two most timid classes—came to Him to be healed, and the children, who are ever sensitive to passion and instinctively shrink from hate, were attracted to Him and sang in His praise. The anger which was terrible to the guilty seemed tenderness to the innocent. And so the chief priests and scribes said, in suspicion and alarm, "Hearest Thou what these say?" But He justified the children thus: "Yea, did ye never read, Out of the mouths of babes and sucklings Thou hast perfected praise?" And His own action, how does He justify it? By comparing the ideal with the actual temple¹: the ideal was to be a House of Prayer for all nations, but the actual had been made a den of robbers, *i.e.*, they had narrowed it, and had prostituted the pure house of God to their own sordid uses. And He claimed the right to raise up the fallen ideal—and as Messiah He could claim no less—and to open the door wide to the pure in heart, who could see God, but could not trade in the holy place.

He thus, in effect, said that as they had failed to understand prophecy, they had failed to realize worship. The counterpart of the dumb oracle was the defiled altar. And so He affirmed His right to govern the house of God, to declare invalid the authority of the men who claimed to stand in the Aaronic succession and to sit in Moses' seat, to abolish the old and institute a new order, to introduce the hour when the true worshipper was to "worship the Father in spirit and in truth." But in order to see the full meaning of the act, we must here introduce a dislocated

¹ xxi. 14-16.

saying. At the trial two false witnesses appear and testify : "This man said, I am able to destroy the temple of God, and to build it in three days,"¹ and the words were repeated by the mockers at the cross.² The saying, which was truly told, but falsely interpreted, evidently belongs here, and means that He had conceived Himself as the spiritual reality of which the temple was the material counterpart. What it was in symbol He was in truth—the medium for the reconciliation of man and God. In Galilee His controversy had been with the Pharisees touching tradition and the law, here it was with the priests touching worship and the temple ; but the same idea lies behind both—His transcendence of the system which the Jew regarded as absolute and final : the Son of Man is greater than the temple,³ and the Lord of the Law ;⁴ both are from Him, through Him, and for Him. In the background of His mind, regulating His speech and action, is the thought of the ideal temple, which was profaned in the profanation of the actual, and as the pure Sacrifice He purged the place where sacrifices were impurely offered.

II.

But it is still more in the teaching peculiar to the Jerusalem period that His idea is defined. It falls into two divisions, which we may call the exoteric and the esoteric.

A. In the exoteric, or outer, there is a new note ; His words are graver, sterner, much concerned with His death, and the part in it the rulers were to play. Ideas and principles also appear, different from any He had expressed while He lived in Galilee. (i.) There is the parable of the husbandmen, who first beat and kill and stone the servants, and finally slay the son that they may seize on his inheritance.⁵ What is this but a picture of the scene which was

¹ Matt. xxvi. 61.

² Matt. xxvii. 40.

³ Matt. xii. 6.

⁴ Mark ii. 28.

⁵ Matt. xxi. 33-41 ; Mark xii. 1-9 ; Luke xx. 9-16.

passing before His eyes and theirs? (ii.) There is His interpretation of the stone which the builders rejected, but which yet became the chief stone of the corner.¹ The builders are the rulers; He Himself is the stone, hastily set aside, but so terrible that it breaks whoever falls on it, and grinds to powder the man on whom it falls. No words could more clearly forecast their respective parts in the immediate future and in the subsequent history. (iii.) There is the parable of the Marriage Supper,²—full of the tragedy of the moment,—the bidden guests scornfully refusing to come, the servants spitefully entreated, even slain, but the slayers are themselves soon to be slain, and their city burned up, while the wedding is to be furnished with fitter guests. The meaning is obvious: He is the King's Son, now is the festival of the marriage, and the rulers, who in spite of their proud claims are yet only guests in the House, are rejected of God for the rejection of His Son. (iv.) There is the attitude of Jerusalem to Him and His to her. He has a marvellous vision³; on the one hand the city is as it were personalized, and stands pictured as a colossal persecutor, inheritor of the guilt of all past martyrdoms, and so charged with all the righteous blood which has from the days of Abel been shed upon the earth; and on the other hand He stands as Maker and Leader of martyrs, a colossal Person in whose veins flows all the blood of all the righteous; and by whose will the new prophets are fitly to be sent to deliver their testimony and endure the cross; *i.e.* He conceives the hour to be at hand when acts are to be done which will epitomize and embody all the martyrdoms of all the holy who have ever lived. But He who sees Himself and His thus suffer at her hands, is the very One whose mission and passion it was to save and shelter her. (v.) In the most authentic and sublime of the Apocalyptic discourses He affirms a principle He has

¹ Matt. xxi. 42-44. ² Matt. xxii. 2-10. ³ Matt. xxiii. 34-39.

often implied but never expressed—the vicarious. The good or ill of His people is His; they are one with Him and He with them. The smallest beneficence to the least of His brethren is done to Him; the good refused to them is denied to Him.¹ And, we may add, this idea implies its converse: if their sufferings are His, His are theirs; what He endures and what He achieves, man achieves and endures.

We can hardly misread the significance of these passages. They bear witness to this: that the moment when He foresees His death most clearly He conceives His person most highly, that He regards this death as a calamity to those who reject, an infinite good to those who accept, Him, that those who compass it participate in what may be termed a universal crime, which shall work their disaster while constituting His opportunity to effect everlasting good. The principle which explains these things is His complete identification with all the righteousness of time, or the unity in Him of the being of all the good who are hated of all the evil.

B. But these are more or less external views, conditioned by the antithesis under which they are developed; for His more inward mind we must turn to His words to the disciples.

i. What this mind was is evident from the incident in the house of Simon, the leper.² The conflict in the city and with the rulers is over; and He can speak to His own quietly and without controversy concerning the secret things of His own soul. As they sit at meat a woman, bearing “an alabaster box of very precious ointment,” steals softly up behind Him, and “pours it upon His head.” What followed shows how little the disciples had learned, and how much of their old spirit still lived within them. “To what purpose is this waste?” is their indignant question, while their sordid feeling is disguised as concern for the poor. But

¹ Matt. xxv. 35-40, 42-45.

² Matt. xxvi. 6-13; Mark xiv. 3-9.

the reply of Jesus expresses His innermost thought: "She is come to anoint My body aforehand for the burying." His death fills His mind, and it is to be a death which will leave no chance for assuaging the grief of the living by the last tender ministries to the dead. And He rejoices to see His own acts of sacrifice reflected in the gracious act of the woman; the love that surrenders life feels comforted by the kindred love which covers with grateful fragrance the body so soon to be lifeless. But there is an even finer touch, showing the faith that lived in the heart of disaster. Jesus, while He anticipates death, anticipates universal fame and everlasting remembrance. His gospel is to be preached "throughout the whole world," and the woman's act is to be everywhere "spoken of as a memorial for her." This consciousness of His universal and enduring import is a note of the sayings which belong to His last days, and stands indissolubly associated with His approaching death. His words are to abide for ever;¹ His gospel is, like the temple of God, destined for "all peoples." And these things He speaks of as simply and confidently as He speaks of His death.

ii. But the most solemn and significant of all His utterances concerning His death are the words spoken at the institution of the supper. And here we must strictly limit ourselves to their theological import; their sacramental interpretation lies outside our present purpose; so does the interesting question which has been recently raised, whether we owe the change of the Supper into a permanent sacrament to Jesus or to Paul, and whether the suggestive cause of the change was Jewish custom or Greek mysteries. This question requires a broader and more searching treatment than it has yet received. The later action of the mysteries, and the tendencies that created the mysteries, upon the ideas of the Supper, of the elements, the conditions, the

¹ Mark xiii. 31.

effects, and the modes of observance, may be established by various lines of proof; but we see no reason to doubt that the Supper had become a Christian custom before Christianity had felt the delicate yet subduing touch of the Hellenic spirit. This question, however, does not affect ours, which is simply, "What did Jesus mean by the words He used as to His own death at the institution of the Supper?"

In the several narratives the formulæ are not quite identical. As has been often remarked, there are two main versions—that of Paul and Luke on the one hand, and that of Matthew and Mark on the other; but even the versions which are alike significantly differ from each other, and as significantly agree with a representative of the independent tradition. Thus the formula for the bread is simpler in Matthew (*Λάβετε, φάγετε· τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου*), and Mark (who omits *φάγετε*), but more detailed in Paul (*τοῦτό μου ἐστιν τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν· τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν*), and most detailed in Luke (*τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον· τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν*). The variations affect both the theological and the sacramental idea, the former in *τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν*, the latter in *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν*. In the formula for the wine, the cross agreements and differences are still more instructive. Mark is simplest: *τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν*. Matthew changes *ὑπὲρ* into *περί*, and adds *εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν*. Paul says: *τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι*; while Luke combines Matthew and Mark with Paul, thus: *τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον*.

These variations are easily explicable, and show, so far as the sacramental idea is concerned, that the validity of the ordinance did not depend on any uniformity in the formula used; for words so freely altered could not be conceived

to possess some mystic or magic potency capable of effecting a miraculous change in the elements. As concerns the theological idea, the difference in the terms represents no contradiction or radical divergence in the thought. Paul and Luke say, "the new covenant in His blood"—*i.e.*, the covenant which stood in the blood, or had therein the condition of its being. Matthew and Mark say, "this is the blood of the covenant"—*i.e.*, the blood which gives it being and character, which is its seal and sanction. They agree in their idea of the covenant, though Paul and Luke think of it as "the new" in contrast to "the old," while Matthew and Mark think of it, absolutely, as sole and complete. Paul says nothing as to the persons for whom the blood has been shed; Luke says, "for you"; Matthew and Mark, "for many." But the difference here is formal. Paul means what the others say, while the "you" is only the personalized and present "many," the "many" the enlarged and collective "you." Matthew alone definitely expresses the purpose for which the blood was shed—"unto the remission of sins"; but this only made explicit the idea contained in the *ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν* and the *ὑπὲρ* or even the *περὶ πολλῶν*; for what other idea could the consciousness of the disciples supply save that the blood shed "for them," or "in reference to many," was shed "in order to remission of sins"? The phrasing varies; the language is here less, there more, explicit, but the thought is throughout one and the same.

III.

What, then, did the words which our authorities thus render mean on the lips of Jesus? We cannot be wrong, considering where it stands, in regarding this as the weightiest, most precise, and defining expression which He has yet used concerning His death. The form under which He first conceived it was as an integral part of His

work as Messiah, yet as a fate He endures or suffers at the hands of the elders and chief priests. The next form under which He conceived it was as the spontaneous surrender of Himself "as a ransom for many." But here these two forms coalesce in a third, which is at once their synthesis and completion. His death has (*a*) at once an historical and an ideal, a retrospective and a prospective significance; it ends one covenant and establishes another; (*β*) it has an absolute worth irrespective of the form it may assume or the means by which it may be effected, for though inflicted by men, it is endured on behalf of man; and (*γ*) its express purpose is to create a new, an emancipated people of God.

A. But in order that these ideas may be understood they must be interpreted through His experience, the facts and factors that had shaped and were shaping His thought. The covenant which He established stands as "the new" in explicit antithesis to the "old," and finds its constitutive condition and characteristic in His blood. He dies at the hands of the old covenant, but in so dying He creates the new. This makes His death, as it were, the concrete expression of the antithesis of the covenants, and at the same time represents the inmost fact of His own conscious experience. While possessed by the feeling of radical unity with His people, He was as an alien to the actual system under which they lived. He consciously incorporated their most distinctive religious ideas, but He was as consciously in conflict with the men who claimed to be the official representatives and only authorized ministers of the old religion. The degree in which He embodied those ideas was the measure of His antagonism to the men, and theirs to Him. To be the Christ of prophecy was to be the Crucified of Judaism. This was the tragedy of the situation: the Jew had been in order to produce the first, but once He was there the Jew did not know Him, would not

love Him, had no room for Him, could do nothing with Him save compass His death. The words of Caiaphas, though preserved only in the Fourth Gospel, express the thought of his class as broadly written across the face of the Synoptic history: "It is expedient for you that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not."¹ This was but the official version of what Jesus Himself had foreseen and so often foretold. His reading of the religion was the direct contradiction of theirs; both could not live together, and the only way in which they could effectually contradict His contradiction was by His death. But at this point, as to what was to be accomplished by His death, He and they radically differed; they thought that by the cross He was to die and they were to live, but He believed that they were through His death not to live, but to die. This idea fills His later teaching; it is the moral, not simply of the Apocalyptic discourses, but of the parables already noticed,² of His words to the women of Jerusalem,³ and of His lamentation over the city.⁴ It was the supreme Nemesis of history. What fate save death could happen to the system whose reward to its most righteous Son was the cross?

B. But this is an indirect, and, as it were, negative result of His death; the direct and positive is the new covenant which is established in His blood. We need not concern ourselves with the idea of "covenant"; enough to say, it is here held to denote a gracious relation on God's part expressed in a new revelation for the faith and obedience of man. What does very specially concern us is what Jesus says as to His blood. It must be explained through the moment and all its circumstances. He had strongly desired to eat the Passover with His disciples before He suffered,⁵ and He had sent Peter and John be-

¹ xi. 50.² *Supra*, pp. 20, 21.³ Luke xxiii. 28-31.⁴ Matt. xxiii. 38; Luke xix. 43, 44.⁵ Luke xxii. 15.

forehand to prepare it.¹ Now this means that its associations were vivid both in His mind and in theirs, and through these associations His words must be construed. The feast was the most domestic of all the feasts in Israel; in it the father was more important than the priest, the house than the temple. The lamb was not the symbol of sacerdotal supremacy, but of family and racial unity, especially in the eye and purpose of God. Its blood was not shed to propitiate a vengeful Deity, and induce Him to pass kindly over the family for whom it had been slain and the house where it was being eaten, but rather to mark them as God's own, to be the sign that they were His and doing as He willed; in other words, the paschal sacrifice did not make Him gracious, but found Him gracious, and confessed that those who offered believed themselves to be the heirs of His grace. It was the seal of a mercy which had been shown and was now claimed, not the purchase of a mercy which was withheld and must be bought. It signified, too, that since the people were God's, they could not continue slaves, but must be emancipated and live as became the free, obedient to the Sovereign whose supremacy could brook no rival authority. It was the symbol, therefore, of unity, all the families who sacrificed constituted a single people; Israel knew only one God, God knew only one Israel. Jesus did not receive these associations as a letter that killed, but as the spirit which gave life. They were translated by Him from the traditions which acted as the fetters of the past on the present into the ideals which were to govern the future. He manifestly conceived Himself as the sacrificial lamb, for only so can we find any meaning in the reference to this blood; and the figure was beautiful enough to apply even to Him. It was the symbol of innocence, meekness, gentleness, of one who was led to the slaughter, and was

¹ Luke xxii. 8.

dumb under the hand of the shearer; but it did not speak of a victim whose blood was shed to appease a vindictive sovereign. On the contrary, it told of His grace, and was the mark which distinguished His people. The blood could be in symbol only where it was in reality, and wherever it was it denoted a member of the family of God, a man spared, emancipated, introduced into all the liberties and endowed with all the privileges of Divine sonship.

C. So far we have been concerned with the relation of the blood to the covenant, but we are now met by another question: In what sense could it be said to be shed "for you" or "for many"? We have seen that He represented acts done to the least and the neediest of men as done to Himself; but the precise parallel of this is that the acts He does may be conceived as done by man; in other words, He is so the centre or keystone of family or racial unity that in a perfectly real sense His act is universal, while personal. His position is twofold: He conceives Himself as the Lamb sacrificed in order to mark and seal the people of God, *i.e.*, establish His covenant, but He also at the same moment sits in the seat of the host or father, who sums up in himself the household, acts and speaks as their sole and responsible head. As the one He distributes the elements which symbolize the sacrifice; as the other He is the sacrifice which the elements symbolize. The ideas proper to these quite distinct relations, blend both in His consciousness and in that of the disciples. According to the one He is offered for the many; according to the other His act is their act, in Him they live impersonated. Hence His suffering at the hands of man is theirs, and theirs His surrender to the will of God. The outer letter which is abolished by His death, ceases to have dominion over them; the inner obedience which is accomplished by His spirit, becomes a fact of their history, and a factor of their new experience. In other words, by being made a curse for us

He redeems us from the curse of the law; and by means of the new spirit of life which is in Him, He sets us free from the law of sin and death. And so Paul sums up the innermost meaning of His words when he said; "Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one who believeth."¹

A. M. FAIRBAIRN.

CHRISTIAN PERFECTION.

I.

THE WORD "PERFECT" IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

IN modern religious life, the use of the word *perfect* to describe a definite stage of spiritual development and Christian character has been a matter of much discussion. Some have claimed for themselves or others, or as attainable, a measure of spiritual or moral maturity which may, they think, be fairly called *Christian Perfection*. Others have strenuously resisted all such claims. And this controversy has given rise to discussions about various side issues bearing upon the Christian life.

Inasmuch as the word *perfect* is found in the English Bible, in both Authorized and Revised Versions, as a description of Christian character, I shall introduce the subject by discussing in this paper the meaning of the word or words so rendered, and expounding the teaching of the Bible about the persons and character thus described. In a second paper I shall call attention to other important teaching of the New Testament closely related to the subject before us. And in a third paper I shall discuss Wesley's teaching about Christian perfection, and certain modern controversies on the same subject.

¹ Rom. x. 4.

Of the words rendered *perfect* in the New Testament, the most important is *τέλειος*, an adjective derived from the substantive *τέλος*, usually rendered *end*. But this latter word denotes the end, not as mere cessation in time or space, but as a goal attained or to be attained, the accomplishment of a purpose, or the full outworking of a tendency. Its meaning is well reproduced by the phrase "end and aim." This meaning may be detected even where the word seems at first sight to mean only cessation. So Luke i. 33, "of His kingdom, there shall be no *end*": *i.e.* it shall never have run out its complete course as did the ancient empires which have passed away. Similarly, Mark iii. 26: "if Satan hath risen against himself and is divided, he cannot stand but hath an *end*." If the supreme power of evil be divided, his power has run its full course: which is not the case. In other places, the idea of a goal or aim is more conspicuous. So 1 Peter i. 9: "receiving the *end* of your faith, the salvation of your souls." Also 1 Timothy i. 5: "the *end* of the charge is love out of a pure heart."

This idea of a goal to be attained or the full outworking of inherent tendencies underlies the entire use of the adjective *τέλειος*. This last never denotes that which pertains to cessation, always that which pertains to a goal reached. The *τέλειοι* are those who have attained a measure of maturity. This is made very evident by the other words with which the word *perfect* is contrasted. So 1 Corinthians xiv. 20: "be not children in mind, but in malice be babes; on the other hand, in your minds become *full-grown men*." Similarly Ephesians iv. 13, 14: "till we all attain to the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, to a *full-grown man* (*ἄνδρα τέλειον*), to the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ; that we be no longer babes." Still more definite is Hebrews v. 12-14: "ye are become such as have need of milk and not of solid food. For every one that partaketh of milk is inexperienced

of the word of righteousness : for he is a babe. But solid food is for *full-grown men* (τελείων), for those who by reason of use have their sense exercised to discern good and evil." The animal and mental and moral forces latent in the child find in the adult their full development. The latter is therefore called, in contrast to the child, τέλειος.

In 1 Chronicles xxv. 8 (LXX.) we have the contrast of τελείων καὶ μαθητόντων : *i.e.* of those whose education is complete and those who are still pupils.

The above passages, which might be indefinitely multiplied from classical Greek, make the meaning of τέλειος quite clear. It describes an object in which inherent tendencies have attained full development, in which the ideal is fully realised.

In the LXX. the word τέλειος is used to describe an ideal man. In Genesis vi. 9 (compare Sirach xlv. 17) Noah is said to have been "righteous, *perfect* in his generation." In Deuteronomy xviii. 13, after a warning against sorcery, the writer adds "thou shalt be *perfect* before the Lord thy God." In 1 Kings viii. 61, Solomon urges the people, "let your hearts be perfect towards the Lord our God, to walk in His ordinances and to keep His commandments as at this day." He thus bids them tolerate no divided allegiance. In chapter xi. 4, we read that Solomon's "heart was not *perfect* with the Lord his God as was the heart of David his father. For Solomon went after Ashtoreth, the goddess of the Zidonians." David, with all his sins, was loyal to the worship of God : his son worshipped other gods. Similar language is found in chapter xv. 3 ; and a contrast in verse 14. This frequent use of the word *perfect* in the LXX. to describe whole-hearted loyalty to God is in complete harmony with the root-idea of the word : for such loyalty was the immediate aim of the spiritual education of Israel.

In the recorded words of Christ, the word τέλειος occurs

three times, once to describe the character of God, and twice to describe a moral goal to be pursued by the disciples of Christ. In Matthew v. 45, the example of the God of Nature, who does good to all men whether good or bad, is set before His children on earth for their imitation; and in verse 48 our Lord adds, "ye therefore shall be *perfect* as your heavenly Father is *perfect*." He means that just in proportion as we treat men not according to their deserts but on the principle of doing them good we approach the goal of human excellence, and the pattern set before us by the action of God Himself. Similarly, in Matthew xix. 21, Christ says, "if thou desirest to be *perfect*, go, sell thy possessions and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven; and come, follow Me." In each of these passages the word rendered *perfect* describes the goal of human excellence; this being looked at from one particular point of view.

In John xvii. 23, we have the derived verb *τελειόω*. Christ prays that His followers "may be men perfected into one": *ἵνα ᾧσι τετελειωμένοι εἰς ἓν*. He here sets before them unity to be attained by full development of the individual. All defects of character tend towards discord. Christ prays that His disciples may become so mature as to be one harmonious whole. In John iv. 34, v. 36, xvii. 4, the same word denotes the work of Christ, complete or to be completed: *e.g.* "having *completed* the work which Thou gavest Me in order that I might do it." So Paul desired, in Acts xx. 24, to *complete* his course. In John xix. 28 it denotes the *fulfilment* of prophecy; and in Luke ii. 43 the *conclusion* of the appointed days of the feast.

In 1 Corinthians ii. 6 St. Paul says that, although to the Corinthians he did not use persuasive words of human wisdom, he nevertheless does "speak wisdom among the *full-grown*": *ἐν τοῖς τελείοις*. But he adds in chapter iii. 1, "and I, brethren, was not able to speak to you as to

spiritual men but as to men of flesh, as to babes in Christ. With milk I fed you, not with meat : for ye were not able to bear it." We have here again the contrast, noted above, of babes and full-grown men. The immaturity of the persons referred to, which revealed itself in their contentions, unfitted them to comprehend the deep things of God.

In Philippians iii. 12 St. Paul disclaims perfection : "Not that I have already obtained, or am already *perfected* ; but I pursue, if I may also lay hold of that for which I have been laid hold of by Christ Jesus." In other words, the goal is still before him : but he is pressing on towards it. On the other hand, in verse 15, putting himself among the men in Christ, or those who claim to be such, he says, "let us, so many as be *perfect*, be of this mind." That St. Paul here puts himself among the full grown and a few verses earlier disowns full growth, proves that with him the word *τέλειος* did not describe one definite stage of spiritual development.

In Colossians i. 28 St. Paul declares the aim of his apostolic activity to be to "present every man *perfect* in Christ." And in chapter iv. 12 he describes Epaphras as agonising in prayer on behalf of the Christians at Colossæ in order that they "may stand *perfect* and fully-assured in every will of God." In each case, the word denotes that full development of character in his flock which ought to be the aim of every Christian pastor. In Ephesians iv. 13, already quoted, the aim of the Christian pastorate is said to be the growth of each member of the Church "into a full-grown man" in contrast to the instability of childhood. In these passages, the word *perfect* describes, not actual attainment, but a moral and spiritual goal to be kept in view and pursued.

In Galatians iii. 3, we have the cognate verb *ἐπιτελείσθε* (derived however not from *τέλειος*, *perfect*, but from *τέλος*, *an end*), denoting progress towards a goal in contrast to the

commencement of a course. The Apostle asks, "having begun by the agency of the Spirit, are ye now being led to the goal by means of the flesh," *i.e.* by something pertaining to the bodily life? The same contrast is found again in Philippians i. 6: "He who hath *begun* in you a good work will *complete* it until the day of Jesus Christ." In 2 Corinthians viii. 6 the same words are used in reference to the collection of money for the poor Christians at Jerusalem. In chapter vii. 1 St. Paul urges his readers to cleanse themselves "from all defilement of flesh or spirit, *accomplishing holiness* in the fear of God." He desires in them a realisation of the conception of holiness. Similarly, in the tabernacle or temple the priests, as we read in Hebrews ix. 6, *accomplish* (*i.e.* *perform*) the sacrifices.

In close agreement with the use of the same word elsewhere in the New Testament, we read in James i. 4, "let endurance have its *perfect* work, in order that ye may be *perfect* and entire, (τέλειοι καὶ ὁλόκληροι,) in nothing lacking": *i.e.* bear up bravely under all hardship in order that in you such endurance of hardship may produce its full outworking, and in order that so ye may attain full moral and spiritual growth, and lack no essential element of character. In chapter iii. 2 we read, "if any one do not fail in word, he is a *perfect* (or *full-grown*) man (τέλειος ἀνὴρ) able to rein in also the whole body." The writer means that speech is an absolute test and measure of character; that he who is unblameable there has attained the goal of moral discipline.

In James ii. 22 we read that Abraham's faith received its perfection from works: ἐκ τῶν ἔργων ἡ πίστις ἐτελειώθη. We have here the same word already found in John iv. 34, v. 36, xvii. 4, 23, xix. 28, Luke ii. 43, Acts xx. 24. The writer means that in the offering of Isaac Abraham's inward faith attained its goal by outward manifestation. This language is the more appropriate because this outward

manifestation always reacts in strengthening the inward disposition from which it springs.

The same verb is found in an important group of passages in the First Epistle of John. In 1 John ii. 5 the writer declares that any one who professes to know Christ and yet does not keep His commandments is a liar; and adds, by way of contrast, "But whoever keeps His word, in this man truly is the love of God *perfected*": *τετελειώται*. A question at once arises whether the writer refers to God's love towards man or to man's love towards God. The former meaning of this phrase is indisputably found in chapter iv. 9: "in this was manifested the love of God in our case, that God sent His only begotten Son into the world in order that we may live through Him." The latter meaning is found in chapter ii. 15: "if any one loves the world, the love of the Father is not in him." This ambiguity reminds us that between these two manifestations of love there is close connection. "We love because He first loved us." Man's love to God and all spiritual love of man to man are a reflection and appropriation of God's love to man. Since God's love to man is the source of all Christian love, and in the absence of any indication otherwise, it is perhaps better here so to understand the phrase. But the practical difference is slight.

The same phrase, *love perfected*, meets us again in 1 John iv. 12. In verse 10 the writer says, "in this is love, not that we loved God, but that He loved us, and sent His Son to be a propitiation for our sins." To this historical manifestation he adds a practical moral inference: "if God so loved us, we also ought to love one another." He goes on to say that if we do so, in us dwells the unseen God and His love is *perfected* in us. It is most easy to understand the love of God in verse 12 in the same sense as in verse 9, viz. the love manifested in the mission of His Son to save man. This Divine love works out in us its full tendency in

moving us to love our fellows. It does this by moving us to love Him who first loved us, and then to love those for whom He gave His Son to die. Thus in the believer's love for his fellow-men the essential love of God, manifested historically in Christ, finds its full manifestation, and thus attains its goal.

In verse 16 the writer asserts, after a similar assertion in verse 8, that "God is love"; and adds that he who dwells in love, *i.e.* who has love for his inward environment, dwells in God and God dwells in him. He then goes on to say in verse 17, "in this (mutual indwelling), love *is perfected* with us, in order that we may have boldness in the day of judgment." It is needless to give here to the word *is perfected* any other meaning than that already found in verse 12 and in chapter ii. 5. The eternal love manifested in the historic mission and death of the Son of God finds in the mutual indwelling of God and man its full outworking and manifestation. In this sense it is perfected in them, just as Abraham's faith was perfected in the offering of Isaac. And the aim of this manifestation is that in the day of judgment those who in this evil world are like God may have holy boldness. The love thus *perfected* is in verse 18 called *perfect* love: ἡ τελεία ἀγάπη. The man who is still afraid of future punishment has not received this full outworking of God's love towards him: οὐ τετελείωται ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ.

The teaching of the whole chapter is that God designs His servants to love one another, love being the normal relation of man to man, that to this end He revealed, in the historic mission of His only begotten Son, the love which is His own essential nature, that where this manifested love has its unhindered course it evokes in man not only love to God but love to our fellow-men, and that where this mutual love of man to man is not found there the manifested love of God has not its complete manifesta-

tion and outworking. This exposition gives to the word *perfected* the same appropriate meaning in the five places in which it occurs in this epistle, a meaning in close harmony with its meaning in James ii. 22.

If the above exposition be correct, the words *perfect* and *perfected* denote in the First Epistle of John, not a definite stage of spiritual life, but a full outworking of that love which is the essence of God.

Another Greek word, etymologically quite distinct from the word whose meaning we have just discussed, is used by Christ, in Luke vi. 40, as a description of a degree of spiritual attainment: "a disciple is not beyond his teacher, but every one that is *fully equipped* (κατηρτισμένος: R.V. *perfected*) shall be as his teacher." The same word is found in 1 Corinthians i. 10, "that ye may be *fully equipped* in the same mind"; in 2 Corinthians xiii. 11, "be *fully equipped*"; in Hebrews xiii. 21, "may God *fully equip* you in every good thing, in order to do His will"; and in 1 Peter v. 10, "the God of all grace will fully equip you." Cognate substantives are found in 2 Corinthians xiii. 9, "we pray for your *full equipment*"; and in Ephesians iv. 12, "for the *full equipment* of the saints." A simpler form of the same word and another cognate verb are found together in 2 Timothy iii. 17, "in order that the man of God may be *equipped*, for every good work *fully equipped*": ἄρτιος . . . πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἐξηρτημένος.

The root idea of the word ἄρτιος and its cognates here used seems to be fitness for use or work. This is conspicuous in Matthew iv. 21, Mark i. 19, where fishermen are described as "mending their nets," *i.e.* preparing them for the sea: καταρτίζοντας τὰ δίκτυα. This idea of fitness for use distinguishes the family of words now before us from τέλειος and its cognates, which denote full development, full realisation of inherent tendencies. These ideas of full equipment for work and mature development are found together

in Ephesians iv. 12, 13, in a fine description of the purpose of the Christian pastorate. And they are essentially connected. For all Christian maturity fits for active service.

In 1 Corinthians ii. 6 and iii. 1, we have a bi-partite division of Church members into adults and babes: *τέλειοι* and *νήπιοι ἐν Χριστῷ*. That this division was not technical and definite we have already learnt from Paul's refusal to class himself among the full-grown. This inference is confirmed by the fact that in 1 John ii. 12-14 we have a tri-partite division of Church members into children, young men, and fathers. The young men who had overcome the wicked one might claim to be of adult strength. But neither Christ as His words are recorded, nor St. Paul, has in view any higher state than that of full-grown men. That Church members were divided, touching their maturity, into two or into three classes proves that the divisions are not technical or definite.

From the above we learn that in the English New Testament the word *perfect*, whether representing *τέλειος* or *ἄρτιος*, or their cognates, describes, not actual persons or actual spiritual attainment, but a moral goal set before men for their pursuit and attainment. The only apparent exceptions are a few places in which the word is used hypothetically or rhetorically. Even St. Paul denies that he is already perfected, but says that he is pressing on towards the goal. This proves that when he classes himself among the *perfect* or *full-grown* he does so only to assert the obligation involved in a claim to spiritual manhood. That he speaks wisdom among the perfect is stated only as a reason for not so speaking to his readers.

We also notice that the goal described by the words before us is not always the same. In one case it is indiscriminate beneficence, like the beneficence of the God of nature. In another, it is a surrender of all material good. Elsewhere it is endurance of trial of faith; and in another

place the perfect man is one who has complete control of his tongue. The perfection which fits a man to apprehend wisdom, *i.e.* to understand the deep purposes of God, but which the Corinthian Christians had not, would have raised them above the petty contentions which divided the Church into parties. It must therefore have been moral as well as intellectual. The maturity which the Apostle desired for the Ephesians would, as we have seen, save them from vacillation and error in doctrine.

Different as are these descriptions of Christian character, they are closely related. Yet each may be a definite object of moral effort. The teaching of the New Testament about perfection, as a whole, holds before us, for our pursuit and attainment, a measure of moral and intellectual and spiritual maturity as much above the actual condition of some of the members of the apostolic Churches as is the strength and development of manhood above the weakness and waywardness of a child. He sets before us a moral and spiritual ideal, suited to every one in every position in life. The value of such ideal as an inspiration and guide has been recognised by all who have risen above their fellows in spiritual stature. For we shall never rise above our ideal. And without an ideal our path in the future will be limited by our attainments in the past, or at best by the attainments of others around us.

How the various ideals embodied in the teaching of the New Testament about perfection are to be realised, that teaching does not state. The way of perfection must be traced in other teaching of Christ and His apostles. In another paper I hope to call attention to other all-important teaching of the New Testament bearing most closely upon the subject now before us, and supplementing the teaching expounded above. But it has no definite bearing on the use of the word *perfect*, nor is it directly connected with the teaching in which that word is found.

Meanwhile we have learnt that some whom St. Paul recognises as possessing the real spiritual life of children of God were yet immature and unstable as children, that before even the most mature he sets a still higher maturity as a definite goal for spiritual effort, that he taught that all spiritual maturity is a relative fitness for the service of Christ, and taught that the surest mark of spiritual maturity is consciousness of the need of, and eagerness for, still further growth.

JOSEPH AGAR BEET.

NOTES ON OBSCURE PASSAGES OF THE PROPHETS.

THE distinction maintained in one of the XXXIX. Articles between the "four prophets the greater" and the "twelve prophets the less" is, we may hope, on its way to the land of oblivion. Expositors at any rate have found out its unreality, and study the "four" (or rather "three") and the "twelve" with equal humility and respect; or, if a difference is ever made, it is probably in favour of those who used to be called the "minor prophets." Hitzig wrote, in 1838, respecting the earlier commentators on the Dodecapheton: "Too often the flesh of the expositors was willing, but the spirit was weak; and the least in the kingdom of knowledge found in his insignificance a call to take up the explanation of a small prophet."¹ This cannot any longer be said. A prophet is no longer reckoned as a minor one because his record is scanty. Nor are there many specimens left of what Hitzig calls the *Universalkritiker*, the critic who soars above details and gives clever, generalizing views of men and periods; almost everywhere the necessity of the division of labour is heartily recognised.

¹ *Die zwölf kleinen Propheten*, erklärt von F. Hitzig. Leipzig, 1838. "Vorwort," p. vi.

This is of course not intended to discourage those students who aspire to master the entire field of Old Testament study; the achievement of their aim must, however, plainly come as the reward of many years of work, and no sooner does it seem to have been achieved than the reality of their success will appear to the workers themselves to be problematical. Never mind; let us aim at the stars, and not at the garden palings. But let us always remember that though some workers are more versatile than others, no well-trained and industrious student can be dispensed with.

One of the many signs which Prof. G. A. Smith, like other deservedly esteemed scholars, has lately given of willingness to learn from critics who are popularly regarded as rash and arbitrary is to be found on pages 171 and 172 of his attractive work on the *Twelve Prophets* (vol. i., 1896), where he discusses that difficult verse of Amos (v. 26), rendered in the Revised Version,—

Yea, ye have borne Siccuth your king and Chiun your images, the star of your god, which ye made to yourselves.

He points out the serious syntactical and exegetical difficulties of the passage, and refers briefly to the opinions of the most recent critics on the words סכּוּת and כּיּוֹן, which the Revised Version understands to be names of non-Israelitish deities. For his own part he holds his judgment in suspense, and (as the best critics do under such circumstances) leaves the words untranslated. This critical caution is certainly preferable to the rashness of older commentators — of Adam Clarke, for instance, who blindly accepts Chiun, and refers to a Peruvian idol, named (as Picart informs him) Choun. And it is true that the Assyriological explanation of Siccuth and Chiun fails to satisfy such an acute and learned critic as Prof Tiele,¹ who gives

¹ *Geschiedniss van het godsdienst*, p. 315. That Koun and Keiwân are purely

“the tent” (the sacred *parakku* of the Babylonians) as the equivalent of סכות, and with some hesitation thinks “the pillar of the star of your god” perhaps the best rendering of כיון כוכב אלהיכם (he omits צלמיכם). Still I am surprised at Prof. Smith’s suspense of judgment. Had he gone further into the Assyriological evidence, I think he would have been convinced that the proof of the Assyriological explanation is so nearly complete that we ought not to hesitate to adopt it. Of course Siccuth and Chiun are monstrous forms, suggested by *shikkūš* (“an abomination” = “an idol”); Saccut and Kewan or Kaiawan should be substituted.

With regard to the versions, I doubt if it is correct to say, with Prof. G. A. Smith, that the LXX. translator gives τῆν σακηνῆν for סכות. If he read סכות, why did he not render τὰς σακηνάς? Aquila gives τοὺς συσκιασμούς. Surely his reading was סכת. But this, easy as it may seem, is as arbitrary and mistaken a conjecture as the vocalization given to סכות בנות in 2 Kings xvii. 30 (A.V. and R.V. Succoth-benoth). Probably Prof. Friedrich Delitzsch is right in regarding Succoth-benoth as the misprinted name of a god, the first part of which is Saccut.¹ From 2 Kings xviii. 30 we learn that the cultus of סכות בנות was introduced into the “cities of Samaria” by the Babylonian colonists after the fall of Samaria. Considering this fact (which we have no reason to doubt), and also the circumstance that Amos nowhere else accuses the Israelites of worshipping foreign gods, and that the supposed antithesis between “Did ye offer *unto me*” in v. 25, and “Nay rather, ye love your imported deities—your own fabrications,” is really inconsistent with the train of thought in the context,

Phœnician deities, as Tiele, according to Prof. G. A. Smith, once held, seems to me an arbitrary conjecture. To Robertson Smith’s valuable note in his *Prophets of Israel* I have ventured to add a few qualifying remarks in the recent new edition.

¹ *Wo lag das Paradies*, p. 215 f.

it appears certain that, at the very least, Saccut and Kaiwan, or Kaiawan (for so the divine names should, on the Assyriological theory, be read) should be omitted as interpolations, and with them, כוכב, "the star," and either צלמיכם, "your images," or (better) אלהיכם, "your god." Prof. G. A. Smith is half inclined to make this omission, rendering the clause which is thus produced: "And ye shall lift up your king and your images which you have made for yourselves." But the syntactical and exegetical difficulties of ונשאתם remains. Prof. Driver (who does not propose the excision of סכות and כיון) inclines to think that the easiest rendering is "And ye shall take up." But it seems to me that in order to justify such a rendering we must (1) supply a lost passage between v. 25 and v. 26 relative to the objects of Israelitish worship mentioned so enigmatically in v. 26, and (2) produce a parallel for the carrying away of their idols by the Israelitish exiles into their land of banishment. The sense required is, "Nay rather, ye have carried idol-gods in procession." This, however, compels us to omit the whole verse as a late insertion. The editor probably found the original words of Amos illegible, and filled up the lacuna to the best of his ability. In the substituted passage (from which we need only, with Wellhausen, omit כוכב as a gloss to כיון and צלמיכם as a gloss to אלהיכם) he antedates a cultus which was really not known in the land of Israel before B.C. 722. There is not improbably an exact parallel for this supposed insertion in Isaiah x. 4 (see below).

Passing over not a few difficult but attractive problems, I now turn to the close of the Book of Amos (ix. 7-15). Our most recent commentator denies the authorship of Amos, so far as vv. 8b-15 are concerned. It is a serious step to take, and some readers of Prof. G. A. Smith's *Isaiah* and *Historical Geography* were hardly prepared to see it taken. But it is entirely in harmony with the

author's free but (in the best sense) reverent attitude towards the Scriptures to which I have in this magazine given unstinted appreciation that this important and far-reaching critical decision should be ventured. Those who most differ from and regret some of Prof. Smith's incidental utterances will feel bound in fairness to be the most forward to recognise his merits. It is indeed a point which needs to be argued, because of its (to most readers) startling novelty,¹ "that the prophetic books contain numerous signs that later generations wove their own brighter hopes into the abrupt and hopeless conclusions of prophecies of judgment" (p. 197), and that writers "for whom the day-star was beginning to rise [were wont] to add their own inspired hopes to the unrelieved threats of their predecessors of the midnight" (p. 192). I think, however, that we can hardly say, consistently with the evidence as to the character and teaching of Amos, that it was [psychologically] possible for Amos, after threatening the most complete ruin, "to see the sunshine flooding the ruins and to prophesy a restoration." I have no doubt indeed that Amos continued to hope in God even after he became certain that his people was undone. But injustice is done to the austere sublimity of this prophet if we suppose him capable of imaginative speculation on the future. He left the future entirely in the hands of God, who was able "out of these stones to raise up children" unto Israel. And I believe that, out of his extreme desire to be fair to traditionalists, the author has been unfair to the critics. It is too much to say (pp. 191, 196) that nothing in the language used by the writer of ix. 8b-15 precludes us from assigning this passage to Amos. The affinities of language and ideas (for language and ideas

¹ It is perhaps a sense of this "startling novelty" which has helped to blunt the edge of Prof. G. A. Smith's criticism in dealing with Hosea xiv. At any rate, he is, I am compelled to think, far too confident in the soundness of his position.

cannot be treated apart) between the close of Amos and productions of the later periods are singularly numerous and striking. I venture to give a summary of them, premising however (1) that I see no reason for dividing *v.* 8 between Amos and a later writer; (2) that not all of these affinities will be acceptable to students who belong to what I may without offence call the "mediation" school of criticism; and (3) that though the late origin of Hosea *xiv.* is somewhat less easy to show than that of Amos *ix.* 8-15, it is, perhaps, considerably more certain than Prof. G. A. Smith as yet feels able to recognise.

V. 8, "sinful kingdom"; cf. Ecclus. *xlvii.* 21, βασιλείαν ἀπειθήν. *V.* 9, "house of Jacob" and "house of Israel," used of Judah, or of the restored exiles of Judah, as Isa. *xiv.* 1; Jer. *v.* 20; Obad. *xvii.* 18; but in Am. *iii.* 1, *v.* 1, 4 (cf. 6) primarily of N. Israel. *V.* 9, the wide dispersion of Israel (*i.e.* Judah), as Isa. *xi.* 11, 12, etc. Figure of grain, as Zech. *x.* 9, Isa. *xxvii.* 12 ("one by one"). Contrast *ix.* 1-4, for the distinction between the fates of Israel and Judah is unknown to Amos (*iii.* 1*b*, *vi.* 11). *V.* 10, "the sinners of my people"; cf. Isa. *i.* 28, *xxxiii.* 14 (late). *V.* 11, פָּרֵץ, גִּדָּר, as Isa. *lviii.* 12. הִרְסָת, cf. הִרְסָת, Isa. *xlix.* 19, בְּיַמֵּי עוֹלָם, as Mic. *vii.* 14, Mal. *iii.* 4, cf. קָרָם, כ', Isa. *li.* 9, Jer. *xlvi.* 26 (all late passages). Note that there is no express prediction of the fall of "David's booth"; could a pre-Exilic prophet have omitted this? *V.* 12, the phrase "the remnant of Edom" implies a time when the vengeance upon Edom was a prominent feature in pictures of future glory (cf. Isa. *xxxiv.*, *xxxv.*). *V.* 13, see above. עָסִים occurs again only in Joel *i.* 5, *iv.* 18, Isa. *xlix.* 26, Song *viii.* 2, *i.e.* only in late writers (cf. *New Heb. Lex.*). מוֹג in Hithp., as Nah. *i.* 5, Ps. *cvii.* 26 (late in use). *V.* 14, שְׁבוּת שׁוֹב is seldom, if ever, used except of the restoration from the Exile (see Giesebrecht on Jer. *xxx.* 18). For the details, cf. Deut. *xxviii.* 30, 39; Isa. *lxv.*

21, 22; also Isa. liv. 3 ("waste cities"). V. 15, cf. Jer. xxiv. 6, etc., "Saith thy God," in the comforting manner of II. Isaiah; cf. Isa. xli. 10, Ps. cxlvii. 12; also Joel iii. 17, "so shall ye know that I am Jehovah your God." (Lev. xviii. 2, 4, etc., is in a different tone.)

Next, let us turn to one of the many fragments connected together in the present Book of Hosea (Hos. vi. 7-11). Like all the prophets, Hosea is a close observer, and finds a sad satisfaction in graphic pen-pictures of contemporary manners. The passage before us, however, is so dark that Wellhausen can hardly translate it, and divines rather than makes out the meaning. This is his rendering:

⁷They have in . . . broken the covenant; there have they fallen away from Me. ⁸Gilead is a city of evil-doers, full of bloody footprints. ⁹And as bandits . . . the gang of priests . . . in Shechem; yea, crimes have they committed. ¹⁰In Bethel I have seen horrible things; there thou playest the harlot, O Ephraim; there Israel is departed; Judah also . . .

In v. 7 Wellhausen rejects the usual rendering "like (other) men" (cf. Jer. xxxii. 20), and insists that אדם must be some noted holy place, because of שם, "there," which follows, and the localizing of crime in the next verse. In v. 10, besides one minor correction, he reads "in Bethel" for "in the house of Israel." In v. 9, he doubts וכהני and איש; and "murder in the way to Shechem" is, he thinks, certainly incorrect. He cannot heal the corruption of the text, but the sense seems to him clear; the holy place Shechem is a den of robbers, the priests themselves are the robbers, their victims are those who come to sacrifice. More recently some bold but by no means contemptible suggestions have been made by Mr. Paul Ruben (*Critical Remarks upon Some Passages of the Old Testament*, 1896). Of these, one, as it appears to me, *se non è vero, è ben trovato*. With great feeling for rhythm, Mr. Ruben transfers some

words to the preceding and some to the following distich, so that the translation of *v.* 6 will read thus :

“Robber bands are hidden in its (*i.e.* Gilead's) mountains ;
Him who goes down to Jericho they murder.”¹

“Gilead's mountains” ; cf. “the mountains of Samaria” (Jer. xxxi. 5). “Are hidden” (חִבְּאוּ) is suggested by the ἔκρυψαν of LXX., to which Bachmann had already pointed as nearer to the true text than the חִבְּר of the Massoretic text. “Him who goes down to Jericho” (יֵרֵד יְרִיחוֹ) is a correction of a LXX. reading (codd. Alex. et Marchal.), ῥῆρρ ἰεροῦ (ὁδὸν Κυρίου)². That the route from *es-Salt* to Jericho (see Baedeker, *Palestine*,² pp. 176 f.) was a dangerous one, can easily be believed. Accepting this view, it would be natural to identify the city of Gilead in Hosea vi. 9 with *Jebel Osha'* (=Hosea's mountain), which is less than an hour's distance from *es-Salt*, and belongs to the mountain ranges south of the lower Zerka, called *Jebel Jil'ad*. On the name of the sanctuary in *v.* 7 no one has been able to throw any light ; either Adam or Adamah is a possible name, but we expect some more celebrated name. In the great uncertainty of things we may at least affirm that the present text of this difficult fragment is partly based upon the conjectures of an ancient editor. The result in *v.* 9 produces a picture of priestly brigandage and assassination which can hardly be called probable.

Nahum ii. 7 runs in the Revised Version thus :

And Huzzab is uncovered, she is carried away, and her handmaids mourn as with the voice of doves, tabering upon their breasts.

Prof. Davidson, in his recent excellent contribution to

¹ גְּרוּדִים חִבְּאוּ בְּהַרְיָה יֵרֵד יְרִיחוֹ יְרִיחוֹ יְרִיחוֹ.

² שְׂכֵמָה כִּי (the words which follow in the Mas. text) Mr. Ruben corrects into הַשְּׂכִימוֹ, producing for the next distich :

“They rise up early, they commit crimes ;
In Bethel I have seen horrible things.”

the *Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges*, finds himself unable to throw any fresh light on this passage. His concluding suggestion that for *Huzzab* we might point *hazzab*, (1) "the litter" (Isa. lxvi. 20), (2) possibly, on an Arabic analogy, "the lady" (carried in the litter), reminds one of Gesenius, whose friend Rödiger, I find, actually makes the same suggestion (Gesenius, *Thesaurus*, s. v. **צב**). The Targum had preceded both.¹ But while Prof. Davidson's book was passing through the press, Mr. Paul Ruben mentioned in a corner of the *Academy* (March 7, 1896) that for העלתה we should do well to read העתלה, referring to Delitzsch's statement in his small Assyrian dictionary, "*etellu*, fem. *etellitu*, great, high, exalted; as a subst., lord, or, if necessary, lady, used of gods and kings." It now becomes plain that ויהצב is the corrupt fragment of a hemistich corresponding to גְּלֹתָהּ הָעֵתְלָהּ. "Huzzab" is evidently corrupted from some verb in a passive conjugation, perhaps from הַשְּׁפָה, and some word, meaning "the queen," perhaps מַלְכָּה, has dropped out.² The Assyrian root detected by Mr. Ruben in Nahum also, as it appears to me, accounts for the name Athaliah (עַתְלִיָּה), also for the name Athlai (Ezra x. 28), precariously explained by Gesenius as meaning "whom Jehovah afflicted."

Isaiah ix. 19 [*Heb.* 18] is given by our Revisers thus :

Through the wrath of the Lord of Hosts is the land burnt up : the people also are as the fuel of fire ; no man spareth his brother.

The rendering "burnt up" shows how necessary it is for translators to leave untranslatable words unrepresented. "Burnt up" is no rendering of נִעְתַּם; Robertson Smith long ago proved that the supposed Arabic connection of עַתַּם given by Gesenius was imaginary. R.V. follows the LXX., which has *συγκέκασται* or *συγκαυθήσεται*; but

¹ Targ., ומלכתה יתבת ציבה, "and the queen sitting in the 'litter.'"

² Kimchi's נצבה שגל (cf. Psa. xlv. 10) was therefore not so far wrong.

it omits to state this. The reading of the Targum varies between חרוכת and חרובת (Lagarde's text). Both confirm the supposition that the Hebrew text originally had נִצְתָה, which may be interpreted differently as meaning "was burnt up" and "was desolate." Just afterwards R.V. naturally enough translates the received reading כְּמֵאֲכָלָת אֵשׁ "as food for the fire," which seems indeed to be secured by the parallel phrase "is burnt up." Duhm, however, who has induced Häckmann to follow him, proposes כְּמוֹ אֲכָלֵי אֵשׁ, "like cannibals." This, he remarks, leads on to the description which follows, in which the people is described rather as "eating" than as "eaten up" (cf. Hos. vii. 7). But the transition involved in the usual text is not too abrupt for Isaiah. For literary readers it may be added that there is a striking parallel passage in Dante. The poet is speaking of Italy:

"While now thy living ones are constant foes,
And each one gnaws the other—even they
Whom the same moat, the selfsame walls enclose."
(*Purgatory*, vi. 82-84; Wright's translation.)

Isaiah x. 4 (first part) runs in the Revised Version :

They shall only bow down under the prisoners, and shall fall under the slain.

This is not a smooth form of expression, but the general sense is not inappropriate to the context. We seem to expect a threat of punishment for the grandees analogous to Isaiah's threat to Shebna. If, however, we look at the Hebrew apart from the context, and apart from the historical circumstances of Isaiah, Lagarde's proposal, made originally in the *Academy* for December 15, 1870, to read בִּלְתֵי פִרְעֹת חַת אֲסִיר (cf. xlvi. 1, Jer. l. 2, and also Jer. xlvi. 15 LXX.), *i.e.*, "Beltis boweth down, Osiris is broken down," is highly plausible.¹ I have therefore been

¹ See *Prophecies of Isaiah*, ii. 144 f., and cf. Wiedemann, *Sammlung altägypt. Wörter*, p. 33; W. M. Müller, *Asien und Europa*, p. 100, n. 1.

led to suggest in Haupt's edition of the Hebrew Old Testament (London : David Nutt) that a late editor inserted the words proposed by Lagarde in lieu of a group of words which had become illegible, just as (according to the view adopted above) an editor inserted the reference to Sakkut and Kaiwân in Amos v. 26. In both cases the editor fell into an anachronism. It is worthy of notice that Isa. xlvi. 1, Jer. xlvi. 15 and l. 2, all belong to late compositions ; also that the text of Isa. x. 4 seems to have been imperfect in the time of the LXX. translator, who gives simply *τοῦ μὴ ἐμπροσθεν εἰς ἀπαγωγὴν*. It may perhaps turn out that sobriety of judgment is not necessarily identical with critical hesitancy, as has too generally been supposed. Hesitancy is natural and justifiable for a time, but further study may lead even a lover of sobriety to unexpected conclusions.

T. K. CHEYNE.

ST. JOHN'S VIEW OF THE SABBATH REST.

REVELATION I. 10.

I.

"I WAS in the spirit on the Lord's day." Such is the initial note of the greatest allegorical poem that ever was written. It is hardly the note we should have expected. We should have expected the day itself rather than its spirit to have been the subject of the opening chord. A man about to receive a revelation from heaven might be supposed to be looking first of all upon the curtain, to have his eye riveted originally upon the lifting of that veil which was interposed between him and the mystery. We should imagine that his earliest thought would be, What was the nature of that mystery which should be rent into sunbeams when the curtain fell? what should he see when the veil was with-

drawn? This in truth is not his thought at all. His primary question is, not what he shall see, but whether he shall be fit for the sight. The arduous part of the work to him is not the opening of heaven nor the revelation of heaven; it is the preparation for heaven. He feels that what he needs before all things is the spirit of the sabbath. He feels that the things inside this veil cannot be revealed to the eye. There are few spectacles indeed that *can* be revealed to the eye. I doubt if the most beautiful sights in nature are not indebted for one-half at least of their charm to the voices of the spirit. How many things are beautiful this year that were commonplace last! Why is this? It is no additional painting from the outside; perhaps the tear and wear of time may have diminished the actual glory. But the added charm has come from the spirit of a new day—a day which has lent its association to the once-ignored scene, and invested with imperishable interest what yesterday we passed by on the other side.

The question now is, What in the view of St. John is the spirit of the Lord's day—that spirit which the seer regards as essential and preliminary to any rending of the veil between earth and heaven. Every anniversary day requires its appropriate spirit. Without that spirit, nothing which happens outside will reveal anything to the spectator. The day of a Queen's jubilee requires the spirit of loyalty; without this, no streaming of flags will convey it to the eye, no blast of trumpets will communicate it to the ear. The day which commemorates a victory needs the spirit of patriotism; without this the roll of artillery is all in vain. The day which keeps the anniversary of Shakespeare's birth demands the spirit of poetry; without this the banquet has no significance. The sabbath is in John's view also an anniversary. It is the anniversary of creation and resurrection. It too can only be understood by its appropriate spirit. What is the appropriate spirit of this day as it

appears to the seer of Patmos? It is a very important question, because, according to him, in finding that spirit you have found the spirit preparatory to the Apocalypse. Is there any sign of the seer's opinion? It is something in his favour that, unlike his countrymen in general, he lays more weight upon the sabbath spirit than upon the sabbath hour. Has he given us any indication of what he takes that spirit to be? Do we find in this passage any trace of the thought which lay beneath the words, and which led him to connect the visions of his book with the breath of the seventh morning?

I think we do. I believe that, if we join the second clause of the verse to the first, we shall reach a luminous understanding of the idea which dominated the mind of the apostle, "I was in the spirit on the Lord's day, and heard behind me a great voice as of a trumpet." I take the explanatory clause to be the hearing of the trumpet *behind* him. The idea is clearly that of retrospect, looking back. When we hear the sabbath called the day of rest, the question at once arises, What rest? Rest is a relative term; what is rest to you may be hard work to me. I want to know what is that ideal of rest with which you wish me to associate this day. Now, John's ideal of the sabbath rest is that of a satisfied past. It is the ability to look back and say, "It was all very good." The trumpet behind is the triumph behind. It is the sense of happy memory. It is the conviction that "hitherto the Lord has helped us." It is the heart's hymn of retrospect over the way by which it has been led, and the wreathing of that path with flowers across which perhaps it had been brought with tears.

Now, it seems to me that this view of the sabbath rest is borne out both by the Old Testament and by the New. In the book of Genesis it is described as God's rest from creation; but it is a retrospective rest. It is not the joy of prospect but the joy of memory. It is the looking back

upon the work that has been done, and finding that it has been done well, "God saw everything that He had made, and, behold, it was very good." In the New Testament the day has the significance of a triumph. It is the rest of the soldier who has fought the battle and ascended up on high leading captivity captive. Yet here again it is a retrospective rest. It is the triumph of a work done. It is the glory of looking back rather than of looking forward. Olivet has vindicated Calvary; that is the burden of the resurrection song. It is a rest that centres round the exclamation, "It is finished!" rather than round the vision of a new world begun. Alike in the Old Testament and in the New, alike in its Judaic and in its Christian dress, the sabbath strikes one chord—the chord of memory. The spirit of the Lord's day is the spirit of retrospective rest.

We come next to ask, What is it that renders this the fitting spirit for the Apocalypse? It must have some analogy to that inside the curtain, otherwise it would form no preparation for it. And indeed we shall find that what we want from any revelation is mainly a vision of retrospective rest. On a first view it might seem otherwise. We often think that our chief desire in seeking the rending of the veil is to get a glimpse of the future. In that we deceive ourselves. No man would be satisfied with such a revelation if he got it to-morrow. We want, not mainly a sight of the future, but a sight of the past. Our eagerness to see the future is in great measure a retrospective eagerness. We have a notion that, if the future were unveiled, the past would be vindicated, that the light of to-morrow would throw itself back upon the shadows of yesterday. The desire of man in this world is not simply to feel that in another world it will be all right with him. He wants to feel that it is all right now. His hope is that in a future life the clouds of this will be, not simply rolled away, but explained. He wants to see that they never needed to be

rolled away, that they were always sunbeams in disguise. Nothing less than this will content a human soul.

We cannot, I think, get a better illustration of this than one derived from Bible literature itself—the book of Job. Job receives a richer heritage than all that he has lost. He gets grander houses, broader fields, costlier equipages. Yet, every reader feels that if this be all, the book has reached no conclusion, the problem no answer. If a thing has been taken from me unjustly, it does not restore satisfaction to my mind that some one has compensated the loss. Injustice is not explained by being expiated; and what I want is an explanation. I want to know why the blot came, whether it was a blot at all, what purpose it served in the universe. The real conclusion to the book of Job is not its last chapter but its first; not its epilogue but its prologue. It is in its opening verses that we get the key to its close. It is *these* which, at the end of the book, bring satisfaction to the mind, for they become then a retrospective light. In them we find the vindication of the long hours of sorrow. In them we read the secret of the seeming injustice. In them we behold the days of chaos glorified. The revelation of the mystery is not the supply of new raiment to make up for the old; it is the manifestation of that purpose which made the removal of the old raiment a necessity. The rest of the reader is a retrospective rest.

Now, I take this to be the moral of the Apocalypse. It matters not in this connection how you shall interpret it—whether you shall regard its predictions as past, passing, or to come. In any case, the seer finds himself in imagination at the end of the line looking back. He is standing in thought at the terminus of the present world, and his eye ranges, not into coming worlds, but over the shadowy past. In that gaze he finds rest—sabbath rest, retrospective rest. He sees patches of blue in the places where he used to meet only masses of cloud. And he feels that the latest

vision is the true one, that if he had seen correctly at the beginning, the blue would have always been there. That this is the design of the book is, I think, manifest from its very key-note, "Behold He cometh with clouds." Why mention the end of the book at the beginning? Clearly because to the mind of the seer the end was connected with the beginning. The last coming was not a sudden catastrophe interfering with the present system of things. It was the *climax* of the present system of things, the point to which they had been leading up. To his eye all the troubles of this book were tributaries—streams of the river which was to make glad the city of God. The very expression "He cometh" is suggestive. It withdraws the event from mere futurity. He was coming now—in the very clouds that seemed to obscure Him, in the very mists that appeared to deny Him. He was coming in the chariots of fire, on the wings of the wind, on the waves of sorrow. He was coming by the power of those influences that were meant to retard Him. He was coming by the seeming retrogressions of history, by the alleged failures of life, by the actual falls of man. The song of victory was sung over the place of tears.

This was John's vision. He put himself in the spirit of the Lord's day. He conceived himself to be standing in the seventh morning of creation, and looking back. He heard a trumpet behind him—the voice of the vindicating past proclaiming that it was all very good; and it was the sabbath of his soul. Now, I believe that psychologically St. John is right. I think that to our age, even more than to his, the greatest religious rest in the world is that which comes from the retrospect of history. We are living in the environment of a scientific dogma—the doctrine of evolution. It has threatened to root up the articles of our faith. It has asserted that the argument from design has lost its cogency. It has professed to account for the mechanical order of the

universe by the play of blind forces. It has offered to explain the symmetry of nature by the convergence of un-intelligent laws. It has assailed a ground of faith which used to be regarded as an Ararat in the flood of waters. In these circumstances men have looked round for a new shelter. They have asked if there is any hiding-place from the storm, or covert from the tempest. The ark has, in the opinion of many, been driven forth from its original landing place, and compelled to resume its aimless, trackless way. Is there any suggestion of a second Ararat? Is there any hope of a new anchorage? Is there any possibility that the ship of life may yet be directed to a haven where the first rest shall be restored, and the waters shall cease to trouble?

Now, I say that there is one spot for such rest—the history of life itself. Let us ask for a moment, Is there anything about the history of life which evolution, by its own confession, does not account for? There is. There is an element in history which the doctrine of evolution *admits* it does not explain—the fact of progress. I suppose we may take the late Professor Huxley as an adequate exponent of the doctrine of evolution. In the ninth edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Professor Huxley declares that evolution has no necessary connection with progress—that it is equally compatible either with going on, going back, or standing still. This is a most important admission. If progress is not necessarily involved in evolution, then the fact of progress demands an additional agency. If evolution had a choice of roads, why has it chosen the most difficult one? The machine had the alternative of advancing, retreating, or permanently stopping. Why has it taken the first course? The other two courses were much easier. To make it a retrograde movement, or to refuse to move at all beyond the limits of the first species, would, either of them, have been the simpler and therefore the more natural way. But nature has elected to go on, and to go on over a

most complicated path. It has chosen the narrow way, the steep way, the upward way, and it has maintained its choice in spite of infinite obstructions and innumerable actual reverses.

Do not misunderstand me. I am not arguing against the doctrine; I am arguing against its exclusive agency. Nature has made a choice—a selection; and it is not a natural selection. It has chosen to go up the hill, with two other alternatives before it. That choice indicates something as special as a special creation. Why do we value the belief in a special creation? Is it not simply because it implies a purpose, a choice on the part of nature? Here, in the very heart of evolution, there is necessitated the same choice; things go up when they might go down, when they might remain moveless. We take our stand beside the seer of Patmos; we look back. We expect to find the elements of decay, or, at the most, the forms of stagnation. Instead of that, what do we see? The steps of an ascending stair as aspiring as the ladder of Jacob. We hear the sound of a trumpet behind us; the voice of the past is a voice of triumph. Each move is a movement forward, each act is an ascent. The block of dead matter, the crystal, the plant, the animal, the primitive man, the tribal man, the national man, the cosmopolitan man—all these rise before us like the sloping steps of an altar. A hundred influences are present to interrupt their ascent: but they climb pertinaciously to their sabbath, and pause not till they reach the goal. What is that but a deliberately selective purpose—a revelation of the fact that, when the foundations of the earth were laid, Divine Wisdom was there.

This, then, to us, as to the seer of Patmos, is still the sabbath rest of the soul. He sought his revelation from the past. The joy of the Apocalypse is mainly a retrospective joy. All its songs point back. All its notes of jubilee are

over the triumph behind—the triumph that came out of the tragedy. If men cease not day nor night to praise, it is from the vision of yesterday, the vision of the crown through the cross: “worthy is the Lamb that was slain.” Some such vision awaits our retrospect too. It is through the cross of struggle that the world has reached the present goal, its upward goal. It is through the midst of the forces making for stagnation or for retardation that this wondrous piece of mechanism has cleared its way, steering ever toward the stars. In the light of such a fact, the mode of its origin seems a small thing. Call it creation, call it evolution, call it emanation, call it what you will, the fact remains inviolate and inviolable, that it moves along a path of purpose, and selects a course demanding intelligent choice. With such a retrospect as that, we may well be in the spirit of the Lord’s day.

GEORGE MATHESON.

THE LINGUISTIC HISTORY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT AND MAURICE VERNES’ DATING OF THE DOCUMENTS.

It has long been recognised that the linguistic characteristics of literary documents provide a valid criterion when the origin of a particular literature is under discussion. The saying “*ἡ λαλιά σου δῆλόν σε ποιεῖ*” (Matt. 26. 73) applies also to books. And the fact has been grasped and applied by the historians of profane literature. For example, Th. Vogel,¹ in reference to a dialogue ascribed to Tacitus, has proved by linguistic arguments, “*Universum colorem sermonis adeo esse Quintilianicum, ut non modo aequalem ejus sed amicum discipulumve scriptorem fuisse*

¹ Th. Vogel, *De Dialogi qui Taciti nomine fertur sermone Judicium*. Lipsiae, 1831.

statuendum sit." Further, Dittenberger¹ wrote: "Where there is a question as to the genuineness or non-genuineness of any work, there can be no more trustworthy ground of investigation than an accurate and searching observation of linguistic usage. This is recognised on all hands, at least in principle, although in practice this is unfortunately not the method always followed." Dittenberger's principle and result have quite lately been examined and established by Joh. von Arnim.² He has given an exhaustive examination to the "formulae affirmationis" which are employed in Plato's writings: in the first place to the "adverbia quae vim augendi habent" (πάνυ, μάλα, σφόδρα, παντάπασιν, ναί, πάντως, παντελῶς, ὑπερφυῶς, and κομιδῆ), and subsequently to form other "genera affirmationum." In the course of this examination he has discovered such important distinctions between the different works of Plato that he is able, by the aid of these distinctions, to arrange them in a chronological series.

It must be observed, however, that in the application of literary arguments derived from linguistic features it is, above all, necessary to distinguish carefully between the two following groups of linguistic phenomena. We must separate such linguistic differences as can be described as *coeval* because they appear in authors of the same linguistic stage, from those which are to be called *successive* because they present themselves in consecutive periods of the language in question.

For example, the differences which Dittenberger and Von Arnim have observed in Plato's writings are *coeval*, and differences of the same kind can be established in the Old Testament. Observe the linguistic peculiarities of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, which I pointed out in my previous

¹ Dittenberger (Professor in Halle), "Sprachliche Kriterien für die Chronologie der Platonischen Dialoge" (in *Hermes*, 1881, pp. 321-345).

² V. Arnim, *De Platonis Dialogis quaestiones chronologicae*, 1896.

article (EXPOSITOR, 1896, p. 90 f.). But still more noteworthy in this respect are the two pairs of actual contemporaries—Jeremiah and Zephaniah, Haggai and Zechariah. The latter pair, for instance, agree together in the frequent use of the Infinitive Absolute in place of the Finite Verb; cf. Haggai 1. 6 (four times), 9; Zechariah 3. 4; 6. 10; 7. 3, 5. But the one, in order to move his hearers to earnest zeal, employs the simple expression, “Be strong” (Hag. 2. 4, three times); the other says, “Let your hands be strong” (Zech. 8. 9, 13); cf. Haggai 1. 5, 7; 2. 15, 18, with Zechariah 1. 4.

Still more important, however, are the *successive* differences in diction. The fact that these differences appear in the style of the Old Testament did not wholly escape the scholars of earlier centuries. Buxtorf¹ himself, for instance, remarked on וְיָצַד (Eccles. 5. 14; 9. 12; 10. 3; 12. 7), “Apud Rabbinos frequentissimus est; at in Bibliis nonnisi in Ecclesiaste reperitur.” This was an indication that the form of Hebrew which appears in Koheleth marks a stage of transition from the old Hebrew to the new. Similarly, in our own time, Kauler² has concluded, “At the very first glance into the Hebrew text of the Book of Ecclesiastes the conviction forces itself upon every competent student that the Hebrew here bears the marks of a much later linguistic period than the Solomonic, and even than the classical period of Jewish literature as a whole.”

But the *successive* differences which are found *within* the Old Testament literature were accurately recognised for the first time in our own century. In particular Gesenius³

¹ Buxtorf, *Thesaurus Grammaticus*, 1651, p. 538.

² Franz Kauler (Professor of Catholic Theology in Bonn), *Einleitung in die Heilige Schrift*, 1892, ii. 393.

³ Gesenius, *Geschichte der Hebräischen Sprache und Schrift*, 1815, p. 20 ff.: “With the exile there begins a new epoch of speech and literature, which is distinguished especially by approximation to the East-Aramaic dialect, to which the Jews had become accustomed in the land of the Exile.

already distinguished "two eras" in the diction of the Old Testament. Since then, however, these successive differences in Old Testament Hebrew have been established with far greater care. An important achievement was the observation of the respective frequency with which the two expressions for "I" (אני and אנכי) are used in the different writings of the Old Testament. Especially important also was the investigation of the different combinations of numerals and their manifold collocations with their substantives. I quote a single instance. שלש stands before its substantive in Genesis 11. 13, 15; Exodus 23. 14, 17; 27. 1; 34. 23 f.; 38. 1; Leviticus 19. 23; Numbers 22. 28, 32 f.; 24. 10; Deuteronomy 4. 41; 14. 28; 16. 16; 19. 2, 7, 9; Judges 9. 22; 16. 15; 1 Samuel 20. 31; 2 Samuel 13. 38; 21. 1; 1 Kings 2. 39; 7. 4 f.; 9. 25; 10. 22; 15. 2; 17. 21; 22. 1; 2 Kings 13. 18 f., 25; 17. 5; 18. 10; 24. 1; 25. 17; Isaiah 16. 14; 20. 3; Jeremiah 36. 23; Ezekiel 40. 48; 41. 22; Amos 4. 8; Job 1. 2; 42. 13; 1 Chronicles 21. 12; 2 Chronicles 8. 13; 9. 21; 12. 2; 31. 16; but שלש follows its substantive, Joshua 21. 22; Daniel 1. 5; 1 Chronicles 25. 5; 2 Chronicles vi. 13; 11. 17 (twice). Exactly similar is the successive change of usage in regard to the other numbers, as I shall show in my *Syntax* by the collection of all the relative passages.

There is therefore an historical progress of Old Testament diction to be recognised, and the natural character of this process is moreover guaranteed by the fact that it is found to be in most remarkable parallelism with the course of development of other languages, both old and new. This also has been proved in my *Lehrgebäude* by a comprehensive comparison of Semitic and other languages.

Of this knowledge of the historical development of Old Testament diction I propose in this article to make only a single application. For I will only raise and answer the question, What have the successive differences in Old

Testament diction to say to the hypotheses which have been set up, especially by Maurice Vernes, in regard to the age of the Old Testament writings?

Maurice Vernes has assumed the following data for the several parts of the Old Testament:¹ "The Proto-Hexateuch was composed between 400 (or 450) and 300; the historical books between 350 and 250; the prophetic books between 300 and 200; the traditional Hexateuch was completed about 200." Moreover, concerning the work which is comprised in Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah, he says,² "The book might be dated about 150."

In order to arrive at a judgment upon these assertions, I will glance first at the linguistic peculiarity of the prophetic writings. We must recall, in the first place, the order which is taken up by the prophetic books in regard to the use of אָנִי and אֲנִי, which was set forth in my former article (p. 97). But I will mention a further example. I refer to the successive change which appears in the Old Testament writings in regard to the position of numerals and their substantives (see above). In the collection of all cases I have observed the following. In the speeches of Amos, in which numerals occur rather frequently, the numeral *never* stands after its substantive; cf. Amos 1. 3; 2. 6 (ten times); 3. 12; 4. 4, 7*b*; 5. 25; 6. 9. But as in the Books of Kings this position of the numeral after the substantive occurs frequently (1 Kings 17. 27, 41, 43; 8. 63, etc.); so it occurs frequently also in Ezekiel (*e.g.*, 40. 22, 26, 31; 43. 15; 48. 31 ff.); seven times in Daniel, and about twenty-six times in Chronicles.

¹ Maurice Vernes (of Paris), *Essais Bibliques*, 1891, p. ix.

² M. Vernes, *Précis d'histoire juive* (1889), p. 802. His positions are important, inasmuch as many scholars in different countries are inclined to fix the date of great parts of the Old Testament at a similarly late point. If, therefore, it is proved that the assertions of Vernes lack historical foundation, the extreme critical positions of other scholars will be condemned at the same time.

Take now the linguistic colouring of the Books of Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles, where I direct attention particularly to the phonetic differences which come to light upon a comparison of these three parts of the Old Testament. For it is just the phonetic peculiarities which are the most involuntary, and most independent of reflection on the part of the author. Now we find ישי (Jisaj, the name of David's father) in 1 Samuel 16., etc., and also in 1 Chronicles 2. 12, etc., but the pronunciation 'Išaj, אִישַׁי, only in the Chronicles (I. 2. 13). The latter is the secondary form of the word; cf. e.g. יִבְל (Jer. 17. 8) with אוֹבַל (Dan. 8. 2f., 6); just as alongside the old Hebrew יִקָּר we have the new Hebrew אִיקָּר, and as the old Semitic *w* and *j* are softened in Assyrian to spiritus lenis, e.g. יום, Assy. *ûmu*.¹ Further, for the older 'êkh (still found in 1 Kings 12. 6; 2 Chron. 10. 6; 2 Kings 17. 28) the pronunciation *hêkh* arose (Dan. 10. 17; 1 Chron. 13. 12), which appears also in Palestinian Aramaic.² Further, *Damméseq* is the tradition form elsewhere in the Old Testament, and also in 1 Kings 11. 24, etc., but *Darméseq* is found in 1 Chronicles 18. 5f.;³ 2 Chronicles 16. 2, 24. 23, 28. 5, 23. In later Hebrew the very same pronunciation of Damascus established itself, as it meets us in the Syrian *Darmesûq* and in the Talmudic *Durmesqith* (a woman of Damascus). The same liquid sound of *r* shows itself in these name-forms, which appears, for instance, in *m^ekurbâl* ("girded"), 1 Chronicles 15. 17, as compensation for the doubling of the middle radical.⁴ A further step is seen in the softening of Tiglat (2 Kings 15. 29; 16. 7, 10), which corresponds with Assyrian Tukulti, to

¹ Friedrich Delitzsch, *Assyrische Grammatik*, p. 41; *Assyrisches Wörterbuch*, 1896, col. 306b.

² יִי in Jewish Palestinian Aramaic (Dalmen, *Gram. des Jüd.-Aram.*, 1894, pp. 36, 69), and יִי or יִי (!) in Christian Palestinian Aramaic (Schwally, *Idioticon des Christlich-Paläst.*, 1893, s.v.).

³ Both these passages are wanting in Mendelheim's Concordance (1896), col. 1394d, 1395a.

⁴ Compare many other illustrations in my *Lehrgebäude*, ii. 472f.

Till'gat (1 Chron. 5. 6, 26; 2 Chron. 28. 20). In the same passages, in place of Pil'eser (2 Kings 15. 29, etc.), in which are reflected the Assyrian words *Apil-Ešarra*, we find the pronunciation *Piln'eser* or *Pilneser*, that is to say, the softening consonant *n*.

We observe, also, a great number of alterations, if we take the Books of Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles, which run parallel in their subject matter, and compare their Hebrew in regard to other grammatical points, and also in regard to their lexical material. Here observe the excellent collection of the lexical peculiarities of the Chronicles, which has been printed by Professor Driver in his *Old Testament Literature*, chap. xii. I will refer only to a single case, which should invite special interest, but has not been noticed by Dr. Driver. There are in the Old Testament two synonyms for "going into exile" and "exiles." Of these two, *galûth* is used only in Amos 1. 6, 9; Obadiah 20b; Isaiah 20. 4; Jeremiah 24, 5; 28. 4; 29. 22; 40. 1; 52. 31; Ezekiel 1. 2; 33. 21; 40. 1; Isaiah 45. 13, and 2 Kings 25. 27. This word is found, however, in no post-exilic book, but there it is always the other synonym that appears, viz., *gôlâ*, Zechariah 6. 10; Esther 2. 6; Ezra 1. 11, etc. (eleven times); Nehemiah 7. 6, and 1 Chronicles 5. 22.

In the field of syntax I may give the following text. I have undertaken an examination of the use of Lamed as an exponent of the accusative in accordance with the same principles in all the writings of the Old Testament. I have found the Lamed in the Books of Samuel and Kings, which are specially to be noted as parallel writings to the Chronicles in the following passages: in לְכַלְכֵּם, 1 Samuel 22. 7bβ, where the Targum, and especially the Peshitto, might very well have written *l*, seeing that in Aramaic also the accusative is introduced by ל, \. When, however, there is really an imitation of the לְכַלְכֵּם of verse 7a, the LXX. has

rightly rendered *καὶ πάντας*; further, in 2 Samuel 3. 30; 6. 16; 8. 5; 2 Kings 8. 6; 19. 21: but in Chronicles, 1 Chronicles 5. 26 $\alpha\beta$; 15. 29; 16. 4, 37 a (18. 5; 22. 17, 19 a in connection with the Infinitive); 25. 1 a (26. 27 b with Infinitive); 29. 20 b , 22 b ; 2 Chronicles 2. 12 (5. 11 b with Infinitive); 6. 42 (10. 6); 15. 13; 17. 3 b , 4 a , 7; 19. 2; 20. 3; 23. 1; 24. 12 b ; 25. 10 a (26. 10 a), 14 b ; 28. 15 $\alpha\beta$ (28. 16; 31. 21; 32. 17; 34. 3).

Now it can be readily understood that a great development of the Hebrew tongue took place between 560, the probable date of the composition of the Books of Kings, and 300, when the Books of Chronicles most probably were formed.¹ For in this period, *circa* 560–*circa* 300, there fell that terrible catastrophe through which the tree of which Isaiah had spoken (6. 13) had been uprooted from its ancient place, and transplanted into a foreign kingdom.

But it would be in the highest degree improbable that the Hebrew language should have started from the phase in which we find it in the speeches of Amos, and traversed all the numerous stages of development which we can observe down to the Books of Jeremiah and Ezekiel within the period from 300 to 200.

Nay, this improbability rises to a *non plus ultra*, if the following fact is borne in mind. Alongside of the series which is formed by the historical books of the Old Testament there runs parallel, according to linguistic criteria, the series which is formed by the writings of the prophets from Amos to Malachi. The proof lies in what I have already stated in my former paper (p. 97) concerning the use of יָנַח and יָנַח , and in what I have remarked above concerning the relation of numerals and their substantives.

According to the theory of Vernes, the prophetic books

¹ Compare my *Einleitung in das A.T.*, pp. 268f., 273f.

which bear the names of Amos, etc., down to Malachi must have been written in the consecutive decennia of the century, between 300 and 200.

One of the Jewish "doctors,"¹ about the year 300, must have undertaken to compose speeches of a very early prophet, and have dubbed them with the name of Amos. Then about 290 another "doctor" must have undertaken the first prediction upon another prophet of later date (Hosea). Once more, about 280, and again about 270, the prophets Isaiah and Micah must have been called upon to speak. Soon after that the hour struck for the birth of the writings of Nahum. Further, about the year 240, a "doctor" happened upon the idea of letting Jeremiah speak in the diction of 240. About 230 the writings of Ezekiel would be produced, and their linguistic colouring would be restored corresponding to the plan of development which had been reached by Hebrew in *that* decennium. And so on. It never struck one of these famous Jewish "doctors" as early as the year 290 to introduce Haggai into the literature. Neither could they have constructed the speeches of Hosea in the diction of 230. Verily there must have been system indeed in this fictitious composition.

There would be an improbability just as great in the theory that between *circa* 250, when, according to Vernes, the Books of Kings were written, and *circa* 150, when Vernes finds the date of Chronicles, the Jewish people passed through all the manifold changes of diction which come to light upon a comparison of Kings and Chronicles. Specially great suspicion must be raised by the circumstance that these manifold changes became so completely prevalent within the assigned period, that they established

¹ Vernes, *Essais Bibliques*, p. viii. : "Les deux premières divisions du canon hébraïque sont l'œuvre des *docteurs* qui écrivaient environ de 400 à 200 avant notre ère."

themselves even in the reproduction of written sources. (Compare the parallel passages.)

There appears, however, here also a linguistic phenomenon which serves to brand as an absolute impossibility the improbability just referred to.

The form *Nebû-kadr-eşşar*, corresponding with the Assyrian *Nabû-kudurri-uşur*, is found in the Old Testament only in Jeremiah 21. 2, 7, etc., down to 52. 30 (twenty-nine times), and in Ezekiel 26. 7; 29. 18f.; 30. 10. But the pronunciation *Nebû-kadr-eşşar*, which arose through a softening dissimilation of the two *r*'s,¹ is read in Jeremiah 27. 6, 8, 20; 28. 3, 11, 14; 29. 1, 3; that is to say, only in the section cc. 27-29, which accordingly acquires a separate position in the Book of Jeremiah; and further in 2 Kings 24. 1; 25. 22; Ezra 1, 7ff.; Nehemiah 7. 6; 1 Chronicles 5. 41; 2 Chronicles 36. 6-13; Esther 2. 6; and Daniel 1. 1ff. That is to say, that form of the name which harmonizes with the Assyrian *original* is found in the contemporaries of the king. That thereafter a softened pronunciation arose, is easily understood. But it would not be so intelligible if in prophetic and historical books, *all* of which had been written long after the time of Nabû-kudurri-uşur, some employed the original, and some the secondary, form of the name.

The successive differences in Old Testament Hebrew approve themselves therefore as an objective argument for the essential rightness of the traditional dates of the prophetic and historical books. It suffices in itself to allow the conclusion that the actual history of the Old Testament language protests against the hypothesis concerning the Pentateuch which have been set up by Maurice Vernes. But I propose to return to this question in another article.

EDUARD KÖNIG.

ON DR. SCHÜRER'S REPLY.

DR. SCHURER seems to me not to apprehend correctly the relation between us. He is the most prominent and the most learned champion of a view: I have attempted in a small and humble way to support a diametrically opposite view. It is therefore absolutely necessary for me, not merely to advance positive arguments for my view, but also to suggest reasons for refusing to accept his. My reasons must necessarily take the form of showing why I think his reasoning incorrect; and it is hard to do that in a way which shall be entirely pleasant and complimentary to the learned and distinguished Professor. For my part, I find it so difficult to state in simple and accurate words my own opinions and arguments, that, while writing, I can think of nothing except that prime duty; and I am sometimes apt, all unconsciously and unintentionally, to refer in a way which is perhaps rather brusque and brief to scholars like himself, for whom I entertain in reality profound admiration and respect. But, as a matter of fact, I have rarely mentioned him without some expression of compliment or eulogy, as any one may convince himself who will take the trouble to go over my references to him. Ever since he allowed himself in the columns of the *Theologische Litteraturzeitung*¹ to go to the verge of calling me a "humbug" (though he forebore to spell the word),² I have taken special care to be scrupulous in making compliments to him, and in expressing my obligation to him for the

¹ See the number for Aug. 5, 1893.

² Mr. W. T. Arnold, in the *English Historical Review*, 1895, p. 549, steps in to make Dr. Schürer's meaning quite clear, and mentions that he "only just abstained from using the word *humbug*." Dr. Schürer found it necessary to acknowledge that, after all, I was right in the one point at issue between us, which he did in a thoroughly scholarly way (*Theol. Litteraturzeitung*, September 30, 1893).

instruction and interest which perusal of his works has afforded me.

In his *Reply* in the *EXPOSITOR*, pp. 469 ff., I find no argument that I have not already met fairly and squarely; but a few notes may be added to bring out that, while he fastens on isolated details, detached from their context, he ignores the general drift of my remarks.

(1) On p. 471 Dr. Schürer accuses me of misstating his view, and of representing him to have asserted that a fact was impossible, when he only stated that it was not probable. Dr. Schürer has misunderstood my argument. My whole drift (see p. 198) is to bring home to him that, relying on a theory which he himself considers merely probable and does not assert to be definitely proved, he casts doubt on the statement of an ancient document, solely because that statement is inconsistent with his theory.

(2) Dr. Schürer accuses me of a second misstatement in respect of Mommsen's condemnation of his view. He says Mommsen merely condemns a part of his view, whereas I speak as if Mommsen had condemned the whole. Mommsen, it is true, speaks only of a part; but, with his condemnation of that part, the whole falls to the ground, so far as the criticism of Luke's accuracy is concerned.

(3) Dr. Schürer reiterates his own argument against Mommsen. I need not follow him, nor point out why I think his argument founded on a misconception. It is sufficient for the ordinary historical critic that, since Dr. Schürer's view is one for which even its author does not claim more than probability, and since part of it is pronounced by the highest authority on the subject to be "erroneous in every respect," its author has no right to cast doubt on a statement in an ancient author, merely because it does not conform to his view. Rather he should frankly admit that, since an author (who at the latest can hardly have flourished much more than a century after the

event, and who is universally acknowledged to have used some excellent contemporary¹ authorities) makes a statement inconsistent with his view, that view is thereby rendered too improbable to be worth stating in such a valuable work as Dr. Schürer's great treatise.

(4) On p. 470 Dr. Schürer assumes that the Italic cohort must necessarily have been stationed in Cæsarea if one of its centurions resided there: I have pointed out on p. 198 that this assumption goes beyond what our knowledge justifies us in *saying with certainty*, so long as the subject of detached service is so obscure.

(5) Every scholar who judges from facts and not from prejudice knows that an inscription, which proves the cohort to have been stationed in Syria in A.D. 69, constitutes a strong presumption in favour of an ancient authority who alludes to the cohort as being there about A.D. 40. Dr. Schürer on p. 470 says that "in my zeal I have entirely forgotten to say in how far the inscription could prove anything against him." I did not forget; I merely assumed that Dr. Schürer was familiar with the recognised facts and the accepted method of reasoning about the Roman army in the provinces. The whole burden of proof lies with him, if he argues that the cohort was moved into the province between 40 and 69, for it is well known that the Roman garrisons were not often moved, and that their occasional movements were caused by military requirements, which can usually be definitely ascertained.

Dr. Schürer alludes to "personal affronts" to himself, which he sees in my article. I fail to find anything in the article to which he refers that can be fairly styled disrespectful to him, unless it be an "affront" to him that I

¹ The most sceptical critics admit that the author had access to excellent authorities, and that most of his statements are correct in substance, though they consider them to be coloured and biased.

should venture to differ from him, or to think that Luke is correct where Dr. Schürer pronounces him to be in error.

Possibly, however, Dr. Schürer may see an "affront" in the words (the severest which I have used), "here and everywhere that Dr. Schürer touches on my own department of study, I find myself in opposition to his method of investigation." But is not that perfectly true? And, if it is true, why should it not be stated simply and honestly? If he is right, I am hopelessly and entirely wrong in the views which I have advocated about Luke, about Paul, about Phrygia, and about Galatia. I stake on them my whole reputation, my very existence, as a scholar: Dr. Schürer, on the contrary, might be proved wrong in reference to all these points, and yet remain a great and respected scholar. I take the risk; and I do so with perfect confidence in the issue. Has Dr. Schürer the same confidence? If he has, why treat an expression of dissent from his view as a "personal affront"? I have more than once referred to his opinions about the calculations in *Luke* iii. 1 and ii. 1, because it is obvious that they are so important as to be fundamental in the question. Luke's history rests on those passages: they show how the author tried to work his special subject into Roman history as a whole. If they are historically false, then every historical student will be slow to admit historical truth in the rest of the two books, except on the supposition that occasional good points have escaped maltreatment by a late redactor. I should have liked to state at least one argument on the subject, in order to avoid writing an article that contained nothing but discussion of points already discussed; but after seeing Dr. Schürer's *Reply* in the December number, no time remains for the purpose.

W. M. RAMSAY.

THE "PRIEST OF PENITENCE."

IN the penitential system of the early Church a marked distinction was drawn between notorious and secret sins. While the former were confessed openly in the presence of the congregation, it would appear that secret sins were not as a rule confessed publicly. The actual instances of such a practice are not numerous, and some of the facts quoted by Protestant controversialists in support of its universal prevalence are irrelevant, *e.g.*, the famous cases of Potamius, and, later, of Robert, bishop of Le Mans. Both these prelates confessed their secret offences not to the Church at large, but to their fellow-bishops assembled in council. The avowal of secret sins was usually entrusted to the ears of a priest, whose selection was originally left to the penitent, and at a later time determined by the ecclesiastical authorities, who, by the middle of the fourth century, had apparently appointed a "Priest of Penitence" in the various Churches of the East and West. In short, the duties attached to the *ὁ ἐπὶ τῆς μετανοίας πρεσβύτερος* in the days of Socrates and Sozomen, were performed by the priesthood in general during the earlier centuries of the Church's existence, when the secret offender confessed to and sought counsel from any suitable minister,—*τῶν ἀριστα πολιτευομένων ἐχέμυθόν τε καὶ ἔμφρονα*. The object with which a sinner made his actions known to the priest was to obtain spiritual guidance and absolution. If his offence was such that open acknowledgment of it would be expedient, he was directed to make such a confession and obtain public absolution; if it were better to hide it from the public eye, private absolution would be given him together with, perhaps, the imposition of a public or private penance. The "Priest of Penitence" was especially consulted by those who wished to learn whether or not they were in a fit state to join in the Eucharist.

It is strange that our only information as to this office is derived from two ecclesiastical historians whose accounts do not altogether harmonize. If the office was instituted after the close of the Decian persecution, as Socrates asserts, why does Sozomen derive its origin ἐξ ἀρχῆς? Again, if we accept Sozomen's statement that the office, though abolished in the East, continued to flourish in the West, and especially at Rome, how comes it that all the records of the West, whether histories, lives of saints, canons or inscriptions, preserve an unbroken silence as to the existence of the "Priest of Penitence"? The question is full of difficulty. Socrates' account is usually accepted as more valid than that of the other historian, but, I think, without adequate reason. The inaccuracy shown by Socrates in other matters much nearer to his own time is notorious; and when we find private confession to priests recommended *before the Decian persecution*, we may conclude that there is little warrant for arbitrarily fixing upon that period as the date of the institution of the Penitentiary Priest, and that Sozomen's ἐξ ἀρχῆς rightly implies that the origin of this office had already been forgotten by the middle of the fifth century.

The office of Penitentiary was abolished by Nectarius, in the reign of Theodosius, on account of a scandal which had arisen from the injudicious conduct of the priest who held it. This action on the part of the Bishop of Constantinople was soon followed throughout the East, and the ὁ ἐπὶ τῆς μετανοίας πρεσβύτερος survived only amongst certain heretical sects. What was involved in this incident? Some maintain that private, others that public, confession was abolished by Nectarius' decree. If we turn to the Greek, we find that the scandal which provoked the interference of the bishop arose from a public confession made apparently just before the Eucharist. As the Penitentiary Priest was evidently held responsible for the occurrence, it must

have been owing to his advice that the confession was made at all. May we not fairly conclude from the story, that the injunctions of the Penitentiary Priest had by this time become invested with such authority, that they were carried out with scrupulous obedience, even when, as in the case before us, they would naturally run counter to the inclinations of the penitent, and the general wishes of the Christian community? A public confession of immoral relations with an ecclesiastic was at this time so unexpected, so utterly distasteful to popular sentiment, that the whole Church, clergy and laity alike, were filled with dismay and indignation. Nectarius resolved to avoid the possibility of such an occurrence in the future. He abolished the Penitentiary's office altogether, and so left it entirely to the conscience of each individual to determine whether or not he should share in the Eucharist, "for this was the only way to preserve the Church from such scandal."

The drift, then, of all this seems to be that Nectarius did away with any open confession of sins before the Eucharist. He removed once for all the control formerly exercised over penitents by a recognised official, and always liable to be abused by an injudicious Penitentiary, who, not content with hearing a private confession and offering spiritual comfort, might insist on a public avowal also.

The above is, I think, the only explanation adequate to the facts. Protestant controversialists allege that Nectarius abolished private confession, Roman writers find in the story a determination on the part of the bishop to get rid of public confession. The true theory would seem to lie halfway between these two views. Nectarius cannot possibly have caused the disappearance of private confession, for, apart from other reasons, the practice is fully recognised in the early Greek penitentials of the next century. Nor on the other hand was public confession completely eradicated, for notorious sins were still openly acknowledged in

the East as well as the West for some time after Nectarius' death. What the Patriarch did was to prevent the public confession of secret offences being insisted upon by a recognised official, whose orders were to all intents and purposes obligatory. For the future, after auricular confession, a Christian could determine on his own responsibility whether or not he was fit to approach the altar. The public confession of secret sins had, in fact, by Nectarius' time become almost obsolete and was *ἐγγὺς ἀφανισμοῦ*. Unless this were so, it is difficult to explain two facts,—first, the excitement and disturbance aroused by its occurrence on this occasion; secondly, the readiness with which the example of Constantinople was followed by the other Eastern sees. Socrates, however, did not regard this new arrangement with satisfaction: *ὁρῶ δὲ ὅτι πρόφασιν παρέσχε τοῦ μὴ ἐλέγχειν ἀλλήλων τὰ ἀμαρτήματα μηδὲ φυλάττειν τὸ τοῦ ἀποστόλου παράγγελμα τὸ λέγον, Μηδὲ συγκοινωνεῖτε τοῖς ἔργοις τοῖς ἀκάρποις τοῦ σκότους, μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ ἐλέγχετε*. This passage cannot refer to private confession, but to the fact that now by the removal of any obligation to public confession before communion, no discrimination in the admission of Christians could any longer be exercised, and "unfruitful works of darkness" might be actually present at the Eucharist, undetected and unproved by the other communicants.

The scantiness of our information as to auricular confession in the primitive Church, seems due to the fact that this was then regarded as one of the ordinary functions of the priesthood. All early writers who touch on the subject do so in quite a casual manner, and show no sign that they regard it as anything abnormal or unusual. Every Protestant author whom I have consulted, maintains that the celebrated Epistle of Leo to the Campanian bishops effected a violent breach in the ancient system of confession. Yet the general tone of the letter does not suggest anything of

the kind, nor does a single ecclesiastical writer of the time (as far as I know) pass any adverse comment upon the Pope's action. If innovation there was, it would seem to have been on the side of the clergy censured by Leo. These persons had, "contrary to the apostolic rule," presumed to recite from a *libellum*, in the face of the congregation, the sins of which penitents had been guilty. Leo orders the abolition of so ill-advised a practice—"removeatur tam improbabilis consuetudo,"—inasmuch as it tended greatly to discourage penitence by insisting on a public declaration of sins, "since it is enough that the guilt of men's consciences should be laid open to the priests alone in private confession." It is not easy to see what the Pope means exactly by "contrary to the apostolic rule." Does he wish to disparage this half-mechanical recitation of sins by another person from a written record, which had usurped the place of that personal and spontaneous confession recommended by St. James?

It is of course true that in prohibiting the public acknowledgment of secret sins Leo was departing from a usage which had prevailed to some extent in the days of Irenæus and even Origen. But the practice, it would seem, had never become at all universal even at the earlier period, and had apparently fallen into disuse by the time of Augustine.¹ Leo's object was to remind the clergy of Campania that their adaptation of a practice prevalent in earlier ages was an innovation upon the usages of the contemporary Church, from which the public confession of all but notorious sins had practically disappeared, though public *penance* still continued. The letter illustrates the view of confession current in Leo's time, but can scarcely be said to have itself originated any alteration. So violent a change as

¹ In one of his sermons, St. Augustine points to certain persons who are doing penance for heinous sins, the details of which are quite unknown to the congregation.

that usually alleged could not be effected by a single rescript addressed to a few Italian bishops, and dealing with a case of merely local interest. The sins recited from the *libellum* were apparently those which, whether trivial or heinous, were known to the offender and the priest alone. That Leo is not prohibiting the public acknowledgment of open and notorious sins, seems evident from the fact that public penance for this class of offences still continued in both the East and West, although more and more difficulty was experienced in enforcing it.

E. N. BENNETT.

NOTE ON THE MEANING OF THE WORD
ΑΙΩΝΙΟΣ.

SOME time ago some papers appeared in the EXPOSITOR, from the pen of Dr. Agar Beet, "On the Future Punishment of Sin." He carefully examined the meaning of the word *αἰώνιος*; and I believe I am right in saying that the only passage adduced by him in which the word apparently meant "endless" was Plato, *Laws*, 904A. But does not the word here mean rather "perpetual" or "abiding"? Does not Plato say that the "animal soul" and the "body" are indestructible, but not perpetual or abiding (*αἰώνιον*)? They are always undergoing a process of dissolution and reconstruction. They have, as we should say, no "individuality." On the other hand, they are indestructible, because, if either of the two were destroyed, living creatures could no longer be generated. They are described as τὸ γενομένον, whereas the rational soul belongs to a different category of things. It is not transmitted in generation, but is drawn from the great "treasury of souls" by the Author of all things.

Similarly in Aristotle *αἰδῖος* is used as the contradictory

of τὰ γένητα and τὰ φθάρτα. With him, as with Plato, αἰδιος and αἰώνιος are practically interchangeable, as also they are in much later Greek, as, e.g., the *Apostolical Constitutions* (circ. 340–380 A.D.), in which αἰώνιος κόλασις and αἰδιος κόλασις are convertible terms.

To Plato and Aristotle both these words signified the “abiding” realities of the ideal or noumenal world, as opposed to the unceasing flux or change of things phenomenal. Indeed, I doubt whether, either in Plato’s age or in the time of Christ, or even in the fourth century A.D., the idea of “eternity” in the sense of “endlessness” can be said to have existed.

On the other hand, it is well known that in the LXX. αἰώνιος varies in its meaning, as Dr. Beet showed, according to the range of time in the writer’s mind. But are we at liberty to say the same of the New Testament? Doubtless the classical use had modified the meaning of the word in Hellenistic Greek. But do not the use of the LXX. and that of classical Greek meet in the one idea common to both, viz., “lasting” or “abiding” as opposed to “fleeting” or “changing”? That, however, the word was still used of a limited range of time, appears from the following passage, which occurs in the *Apostolical Constitutions*, a work of the fourth century. In v. 19. 4 the author, referring to the institution of the Eucharist and the observance of Easter, makes the apostles say, “καὶ τοῦτο ὑμῖν ἔστω νόμιμον αἰώνιον ἕως τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος.” Here αἰώνιον is used simply in the sense “perpetual,” and a definite limit is put to the time denoted, viz., the end of the world. A remarkable parallel occurs in the English Prayer-Book, in what is known as the “Consecration Prayer,” in the words, “a *perpetual* memory of that His precious death.”

Abiding or continuous pain seems to be the idea contained in the awful words, “Where their worm dieth not,

and the fire is not quenched," which are, of course, a quotation from Isaiah lxvi. 24. Pain which, so long as it lasts, has no pauses or reliefs may be called "abiding," or "perpetual," or pain may be so called simply from its perpetual gnawing. But these words of Isaiah, which Christ adopted, by no means necessarily imply endless pain.

A friend drew my attention to the use of *αἰδιος* in Josephus and iv. Maccabees. He thinks that the word is clearly there used in the sense of "endless." In the *Jewish Wars*, ii. 8. 14, and *Antiquities*, xviii. 1. 3, Josephus, in describing the beliefs of the Pharisees, says that the souls of the wicked are punished *αἰδίῳ τιμωρίᾳ*, or suffer *εἴργμον αἰδιον*. But does not this simply mean that the wicked suffer an "abiding" penalty, or "the penalty of perpetual imprisonment"? Nothing is said of endless imprisonment. In this present "æon" perpetual imprisonment has a limit, viz., death. And there may be similar deliverance for the "souls in prison" in the "æon" which is to come.

In iv. Maccabees my friend quoted such expressions as "*αἰώνιον βάσανον διὰ πυρὸς*" (ix. 9), and "*ἀκαταλύτους καρτερήσεις βασάνους.*" But does not this last mean "torments which one cannot break loose from"?

J. H. WILKINSON.

A CRITICISM OF DR. HATCH'S "ESSAYS IN
BIBLICAL GREEK," BY DR. HORT. (A FRAG-
MENT.)¹

THIS volume of 293 pages contains "the substance of the lectures delivered at Oxford by Dr. Hatch during his terms of office as Grinfield Lecturer on the Septuagint. It thus gathers up for us the chief points of the labour bestowed by a man of rare power, knowledge, and freedom from prepossession, upon a field of criticism which opens directly into several more important subjects, and in which a trained, historic sense like his is of special value. From beginning to end the book abounds in minute and careful work, directed and interpreted by vigorous intelligence. Its true importance, however, will be best understood by clear recognition of the limitations explicitly pointed out by Dr. Hatch himself in the preface. His work is exactly what he calls it, "almost entirely tentative in its character." "It is designed not so much to furnish a complete answer to the questions which it raises as to point out to students of sacred literature some of the rich fields which have not yet been adequately explored, and to offer suggestions for their exploration." Not a few of the results obtained, and some even of the methods employed, will hardly hold their ground. But that is of secondary importance. It is enough that the book is throughout a practical invitation to Biblical students of all grades of maturity to verify current assumptions, that it reminds

¹ *Essays in Biblical Greek.* By Edwin Hatch, M.A., D.D., Reader in Ecclesiastical History, Oxford. Oxford, 1889.

them of a large mass of valuable evidence as yet hardly brought into use, and that it enforces and illustrates the need of scientific procedure in the handling of this and all other evidence.

The seven essays included in the volume fall under two heads, the Greek vocabulary of the Bible (I.-III.), and the text of the Septuagint and Apocrypha (IV.-VII.). Perhaps, however, more justice would be done to the ideas which seem to have governed Dr. Hatch's own studies by saying that five essays (I.-III., V., VI.) deal with the evidence to be obtained from the LXX. for the examination of problems external to itself, while the remaining two (IV., VII.) are concerned with the textual criticism of the LXX. and Apocrypha.

The reader will do well not to be frightened at some paradoxes which enliven the opening paragraphs of Essay I. (On the Value and Use of the Septuagint). Without at all concurring in Dr. Hatch's sweeping disparagement of all that has been hitherto done for the elucidation of the language of the New Testament, one must needs welcome so stout an ally against the delusion of finality; for assuredly much of the vocabulary of the New Testament, and even some parts of its grammar, stand urgently in need of fresh and more methodical investigation.

The series of paragraphs in which Dr. Hatch discriminates various causes of difference between "Classical" Greek and that of the New Testament are in substance admirable and instructive, though exception might be taken to some verbal details and many examples. Their value fortunately does not depend on the strange initial assertion that "in almost every lexicon, grammar, and commentary" the New Testament is chiefly interpreted according to Attic standards. Dr. Hatch rightly distinguishes these causes of difference under two heads, roughly described as time and

country. Differences due to the lapse of time, he points out, arose partly from causes external to language, such as "the rise of new ideas, philosophical and theological, the new social circumstances, the new political combinations, the changes in the arts of life, and the greater facilities of intercourse with foreign nations" (p. 3); partly from those spontaneous changes in living speech which literary archaism is powerless to arrest. Thus far, he says, the LXX. and New Testament "may be treated as monuments of Post-Classical Greek," and their language illustrated from "contemporary secular writers": but the several books which make up both the LXX. and the New Testament vary largely among themselves in philological as well as in literary character, and in many cases contemporary Greek fails to give an adequate philological explanation such as it supplies elsewhere. Hence account has to be taken, secondly, of difference of country. This consists partly in difference of physical and social conditions, as shown by the change from the Attic metaphors of the law-courts, the gymnasia, and the sea, to metaphors suggested by "the conditions of Syrian life," and still more by the change from the religious and moral ideas of the Greeks to those of a Semitic race, "whose traditions came down from Moses and the Prophets." In the striking paragraphs here condensed (pp. 9 ff.) respecting physical and social differences, it seems to be too hastily assumed by implication that the LXX. translators, no less than the Apostles, were inhabitants of Palestine; and no allowance is made for the influence of the Hellenized cities of the sea-board on the whole country. But what is said of the effect of differences of religious and moral ideas is undoubtedly true, though not the whole truth.

These paragraphs lead the way to a generalization which is virtually the text of the first three essays, and the importance of which, if it be true in the rigorous sense in which

Dr. Hatch puts it forth as "an axiom" "too obvious to require demonstration," he certainly does not overrate. "Biblical Greek," he says (p. 11), "is thus a language which stands by itself. What we have to find out in studying it is what meaning certain Greek words conveyed to a Semitic mind. Any induction as to such meaning must be gathered in the first instance from the materials which Biblical Greek itself affords." The term "Biblical Greek" is familiar enough as a convenient label for the sum of words and constructions found in the LXX., Apocrypha, and New Testament. So used, it pre-supposes no theory. But Dr. Hatch's manner of using it virtually implies that "Biblical Greek" provides the only quarry which need be worked, for Greek as spoken or written by Jews, that within its own limits, subject to variations between author and author, it is substantially homogeneous, and that as a whole it is substantially different from all other Greek, "Classical," or "Post-Classical." On the strength of these assumptions it is suggested that the only safe key to the exact sense of words of the New Testament is their sense in the LXX. as ascertained by a careful comparison with the Hebrew originals; and we are warned against taking into account their sense or senses in non-Biblical Greek.

It may be surmised that Dr. Hatch had some misgivings that his usual language about "Biblical Greek" might be too sweeping. At p. 34 he classifies the vocabulary of "Biblical Greek" under three heads, for the first two of which he allows the use of evidence "from any contemporary records, whether Biblical or secular"; (1) words designating "concrete ideas"; (2) words expressing "abstract ideas," but "found only in those parts of the New Testament whose style is least affected by Semitic conceptions." The third class, said to comprise "the great majority [??] of New Testament words," consists of those which "express in their Biblical use the conceptions "of a

Semitic race." To these alone, words expressive of "abstract ideas," the special conditions of "Biblical Greek" are here implied to belong. But even under this limitation these conditions cannot be accepted to the required extent, that is, as making the LXX. (with or without the Apocrypha) an exact and adequate guide to the lexical usage or usages of the New Testament.

Even if every scrap of evidence about Jewish Greek outside the Greek Bible had perished, it would be rash to assume that all the antecedents of N.T. Greek are derived from the elder books in Greek, or from the particular form (or forms) of language spoken by their writers. Assuredly the existence of a written Greek translation did not abolish the power of the Hebrew original of the Old Testament proper to affect the conceptions attached by Jews to Greek words, either directly or through an Aramaic interpretation. As a matter of fact the New Testament itself, great as are its debts of language to the LXX., abounds likewise in reminiscences of the Old Testament clothed in language unknown to the LXX., and implying independence of it. Of equally mixed origin, it is reasonable to believe, was the moral and religious element in the Greek of Palestinian Jews generally; and it is from Palestinian Greek that the language of the different writers of the New Testament must have mainly sprung. While then neither the Hebrew equivalents nor the LXX. usage of words belonging to this class can be safely neglected, we must not expect to be able to ascertain securely all that they meant to Jews by merely looking them out, as it were, in the LXX.

Again the homogeneousness which seems to be assumed within "Biblical Greek" itself does not correspond to the facts. Dr. Hatch himself, as we have seen, at times recognises important differences of language among the books of the New Testament. But the diversity extends further. Doubtless there is a great though far from absolute simi-

larity throughout most of the Old Testament proper; and moreover Dr. Hatch is justified in appealing (p. 30) to the Hexaplar versions or revisions as evidence that peculiarities of the prevailing LXX. vocabulary lived on down to a time later than the New Testament. But widely different types of language stand side by side in the Apocrypha, as the four books named from the Maccabees suffice to show. To make out his case, Dr. Hatch should therefore have produced evidence for identifying the language of the New Testament (or at least of certain parts of it) with that particular type of "Biblical Greek" which prevails in the LXX. proper and Hexapla. This, however, he has not attempted to do: the list of words on p. 13 makes no such profession, and with good reason. In a large proportion of cases, the fact that words and senses of words found in the New Testament are not now found earlier elsewhere except in the LXX. or Apocrypha, is, in all probability, due only to the comparative scantiness of the extant remains of late non-Biblical Greek, especially Greek having a popular rather than a literary character.

Once more, the exclusion of the evidence of non-Biblical Greek is as little to be accepted as the excessive simplification in respect of Jewish Greek generally, and specially of "Biblical Greek." Every abstract Greek word by which a translator, or author, or speaker, replaced a Hebrew or Aramaic word bore with it associations of its own derived from its use by Greeks; and thus for many a reader or hearer it might add a touch of Hellenic colouring to the Jewish thought which it transmitted. Even had it been otherwise in the first instance, yet in subsequent usage an exact correspondence of sense, negative and positive, between Greek vocables and their Semitic originals, if indeed imaginable under any conditions, would have been manifestly impossible without such an absolute seclusion of Greek-speaking Jews from the miscellaneous world of

Greeks as assuredly did not exist either at Alexandria or in Palestine. In a large part of the New Testament, and especially in the Epistles, a fresh influence came into action, the reflex influence from a new world of readers. When once Gentiles had been admitted on equal terms within the Christian fold, the language used in developing and applying for their benefit the original Palestinian message could not but be affected by the recollection that most of them were Greeks by birth and nurture. On the other hand, this accessory enrichment of the sense of words from Greek associations must not be confounded with the unconscious partial substitution of Hellenic for Biblical ideas in post-apostolic times, about which much has been written of late, and the reality of which is beyond question, while there is room for wide difference of opinion as to its extent and significance.

Thus far we have been considering Dr. Hatch's theory of "Biblical Greek." It remains to examine the method by which he proposed to apply it to the reform of New Testament lexicography. The following sentences will suffice to bring out the main points of the view from which he starts. "That which gives the LXX. proper a value in regard to Biblical philology which attaches neither to the Apocrypha nor to any other book, is the fact that it is a translation of which we possess the original." "That which makes the possession of this key to its meaning of singular value in the case of the LXX., is the fact that to a considerable extent it is not a literal translation, but a Targum or paraphrase." This "fact . . . enables us to check this common tendency of students [viz., 'to lay too great a stress upon the meaning of single words, to draw too subtle distinctions between synonyms, to press unduly the force of metaphors,' etc.] . . . by showing us how many Greek words express the shades of meaning of a single Hebrew word, and, conversely, how many different Hebrew words explain to us

the meaning of a single Greek word." "These special characteristics of the Septuagint may be grouped under three heads: (1) it gives glosses and paraphrases instead of literal and word for word renderings; (2) it does not adhere to the metaphors of the Hebrew, but sometimes adds to them and sometimes subtracts from them; (3) it varies its renderings of particular words and phrases" (pp. 14 ff.). Then follow some eighteen pages of examples and illustrations from the LXX. and the Hexaplar translations. The conclusion must be given in full. "It is obvious that the determination of this relation [that viz. of a New Testament Greek word found in the LXX. 'to the Hebrew words which it is used to translate'] is a task of considerable difficulty. The extent and variety of the LXX., the freedom which its authors allowed themselves, the existence of several revisions of it, necessitate the employment of careful and cautious methods in the study of it. As yet, no canons have been formulated for the study of it; and the final formulating of canons must from the nature of the case rather follow than precede the investigations which these essays are designed to stimulate.

"But two such canons will be almost self-evident:

"(1) A word which is used uniformly, or with few and intelligible exceptions, as the translation of the same Hebrew word, must be held to have in Biblical Greek the same meaning as that Hebrew word.

"(2) Words which are used interchangeably as translations of the same Hebrew word, or group of cognate words, must be held to have in Biblical Greek an allied or virtually identical meaning" (p. 35).

On the first "canon" a few words must suffice. It takes for granted not only strict identity of sense through the whole literature of Biblical Greek, but also (1) strict identity of sense between a Hebrew word and its nearest Greek equivalent; and (2) invariable success of the Greek trans-

lators in pitching upon that nearest equivalent when they employ one rendering throughout the Old Testament. It finds its ultimate and sufficient criterion in Hebrew lexicography, which is tacitly treated as though in regard of the class of words here in view it had no unsolved or imperfectly solved problems of its own. The one example given (p. 20) as of “a single Greek word” thus corresponding “to a single Hebrew word,” is too inappropriate to have been taken except *per incuriam*; but it happens to be otherwise instructive. The Hebrew original of *δούλος*, which occurs about 323 times (exact verification would not be worth while) has six other representatives, *παῖς* (about 315 times), *θεράπων* (about 44), *οἰκέτης* (about 29), *παιδάριον* (once), *ὑπηρέτης* (once), *ὑπήκοος* (once).

The second “canon” includes three sets of cases which have been distinguished in the previous exposition (pp. 21 f.); (1) a plurality of Greek renderings of a single Hebrew word in the same book or group of books; (2) the same in different books (here it is allowed that no more than “a close similarity of meaning” can be safely inferred); and (3) a plurality of Greek renderings of each out of a plurality of Hebrew words.

Dr. Hatch himself notices a large class of *prima facie* variations of rendering which do not yield material for trustworthy inferences of the kind proposed (p. 20, 3*b*); that is, variations due to the occurrence of paraphrastic instead of literal renderings. Several classes of such paraphrastic renderings are enumerated and exemplified at pp. 16–20; as substitutions of simply descriptive terms for “designations of purely Jewish customs” or for “ordinary Hebraisms” of diction, and of interpretative for crudely literal renderings; free dealing with metaphor by addition, variation, or obliteration; and modifications of rendering due to “local colouring,” that is, suggested by the context. This last form of paraphrase Dr. Hatch illustrates by the

numerous and dissimilar renderings of the Hebrew word for *give*, due to its peculiar elasticity of use. But in truth it is too natural not to be of wide occurrence in many translations, chiefly taking the form of the rendering of a specific by a generic word when the precise force of the specific original in relation to the context is not obvious, or of a generic by a specific word for the sake of greater apparent precision. A careful weeding out of such renderings will considerably reduce the *prima facie* evidence for laxity of language in the LXX. Another class of *prima facie* aberrant renderings that might with advantage have been noticed as irrelevant is due to a kind of harmonism, the introduction of words or phrases from other somewhat similar and perhaps more familiar passages. But still worthier of clear recognition in this place were two other classes of deceptively aberrant renderings, those which represent various readings (or it may be sometimes hasty misreadings) of the Hebrew due to similarity of letters, and those which represent modifications of sense in late Hebrew as compared with Biblical Hebrew.

When however all irrelevant matter has been cleared away, there remains a considerable mass of variation of rendering to which Dr. Hatch's proposed method would be undeniably applicable if it were right in principle. But is it indeed true, in the case of any translation, that different renderings of the same original word (or of the same group of words similar in sense) must be taken to have had for the translator a virtually identical meaning? Because a translator has been unconsciously led by the influence of context or association or mere accident to vary his rendering, employing in different places words having a common element of meaning but also (in ordinary use) more or less difference, it is surely rash to conclude that he had no implicit sense of the distinctive force of each word employed by him, and would have been ready in all places to use his several

renderings indiscriminately, much less to use them indiscriminately in original composition. Doubtless one translator will differ from another, as one author from another, in instinctive exactness in seizing the distinctive sense attached by educated usage to each of a series of partially synonymous words; and a tendency to blur distinctions is a natural result of either dulness or want of cultivation. Doubtless also the translators of most parts of the LXX., though not deserving to be called dull or uncultivated,

[Here Dr. Hort's MS. comes to an end. What follows is an attempt to make available for readers of Dr. Hatch's book the notes written by Dr. Hort in the margin of his copy].

p. 4. ἐπισκιάζειν. Dr. Hort points out that in Exodus xl. 29 the original is יָרַץ, which in Numbers ix. 18, 22 is represented by σκιάζειν.

p. 50. ἐλεημοσύνη (α). Dr. Hort's note is "Nay, the meaning is 'We shall (thou shalt) have mercy from God.' The nine places in which ἐλεημοσύνη represents חַסְדִּים all refer to God's mercy, and have a motive in the context."

The passages referred to are Deuteronomy vi. 25 and xxiv. 13 (15), cited by Dr. Hatch as places in which no other meaning than "righteousness" is possible for ἐλεημοσύνη.

p. 65. 1 Kings ix. 7 and Ezekiel xiv. 8. εἰς ἀφανισμόν for εἰς παραβολήν. The rendering due to a confusion in Hebrew with אֲבָדָה or אֲבָדָה (ἀφανισμός).

p. 92. Dr. Hatch argues from the substitution of ὑποκριτής by Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion for the LXX. ἀσεβής in several places as a rendering of רָשָׁע, "that early in the second century, and among Greek-speaking Jews, ὑποκριτής had come to mean more than merely 'the actor of a false part in life.' It connoted 'positive badness.'" Dr. Hort's comment is, "No; [these places] merely shew the later translators took the Hebrew not in its Biblical sense, 'profane,' but in its undoubted rabbinical sense, 'hypocrite.'"

p. 141. On Genesis i. 9. In correction of the assumption that apparere in a Latin rendering points to ἀναφανῆναι in the Greek

text rendered, while *videri* points to *ὀφθῆναι*, Dr. Hort remarks, "In nearly all the twenty-five places from New Testament, *ὀφθῆναι* is rendered by both *videor* and *appareo*; but *appareo* largely predominates, especially in the later texts, and apparently is the only rendering in Augustine."

p. 141 f. On Genesis i. 24. A ponderous endeavour to make out "that in very early times *τετράποδα* was substituted for the more usual *κτῆνη* as the translation of *רֶגֶל רֶגֶל*," elicits the remark, "*τετράποδα* is the rendering ten times in Exodus and Leviticus, *κτῆνη*, as a *v. l.* here comes of course from the next verse." The statement that the hypothesis is confirmed by the quotation of the passage in St. Basil and St. Cyril of Jerusalem (who both have *κτῆνη*) is met by the question, "Why so? Is their LXX. text exceptionally pure?": and the suggestion that the hypothesis explains the other variants in the MSS. by the question, "What does this mean? Given the two renderings, whatever their origin, conflation would easily make a doublet."

p. 143. Genesis i. 26. "Evidently the much quoted sentence was traditionally current in a simplified form with *ἡμετέραν* transposed and (mostly) with the second *καθ'* omitted. But it does not follow that any MS. of LXX. ever had this."

On the words, "The controversial importance of the pronoun is shown by the Gnostic controversies, *Epiphani. Hæres.*, 23. 1, 5," Dr. Hort writes, "But not of its position; and indeed the whole may be a mare's nest of Epiphanius."

p. 145 f. On Genesis ii. 2, 3. Rather than regard *τῆ ἑκτῆ* as the earliest instance of a dogmatic gloss for *τῆ ἐβδόμῃ*, it is "simpler to suppose that sequence of facts suggested sequence of days."

p. 148. On Gen. ii. 7, Dr. Hatch writes: "The variants which are found in Philo, *ἐνέπνευσεν* ['once only,' says Dr. Hort] and *ἐνεφύσησεν*, *πνοήν* and *πνεῦμα*, have parallels in the Latin versions, which show that they existed side by side in very early times."

Dr. Hort's comment is: "Surely only duplicate renderings of a single Greek text. Similarly Cyprian (*Ep.*, 93. 7) has *inspiravit* in Isa. xx. 22." Lower down on the same page, with reference to the quotations from Wisdom xv. 11, he remarks: "*ἐμπνέω*, a most natural word by Greek usage."

p. 150. (On Gen. ii. 19.) Philo's "*τοῦτο ὄνομα τοῦ κληθέντος ἦν*" does not "confirm the reading *αὐτοῦ*" (for *αὐτῶ*) but "rather it proceeds from the same instinct."

p. 152. (On Gen. iv. 3.) Dr. Hatch asserts that δῶρον and θυσία are commonly interchanged in the LXX. as translations of *minchah*. Dr. Hort's comment on this assertion is: "It is not at all true that δῶρον and θυσία are commonly interchanged in the LXX. as renderings of *minchah*. Δῶρον is used for presents not oblations except in this one place clearly; and also 1 Chronicles xvi. 29; 2 Chronicles xiii. 23; Isaiah lxvi. 20; where Jehovah is the recipient, but [as the following verses show] the offerings are regarded as presents to Him. (In 1 Kings viii. 64; Isa. xix. 21, δῶρον is spurious.)"

p. 152. (On Gen. viii. 21.) Dr. Hort adds that Philo omits αὐτοῦ also in the earlier part of the fragment next quoted, and then proceeds to give the full form of the part of that fragment which is quoted, noting that what Dr. Hatch gives is "an abridgment of the Armenian text." The full form is "ὅρα γὰρ αἷς ἐγκεχάραται πάντων, ὡς φησιν, ἡ διάνοια ἐπιμελῶς καὶ οὐ παρέργως, τουτέστιν συγκεκόλληται καὶ προσήρμυσται." Then it is clear that ἐγκεχάραται (instead of being "an alternative translation of רָצַח") "is only part of an explanation: 'si inest, primum non existit obiter, sed intus insculptum et adhaerens ei.'" Dr. Hort further suggests that the LXX. probably read ἡ ψυχή for ἡ ψυχή ("the mind of men is inclined"), and that ἔγκειται is due to this reading.

p. 169. (On Gen. xlix. 10.) After perusing the paragraph suggesting ᾧ τὸ ἀποκειμένον (τὰ ἀποκείμενα) αὐτῷ as the reading of the original version, it is like getting into fresh air to find written in the margin: "But how about the sense? ᾧ makes the subject of ἔλθῃ a person who needs to be defined, and then αὐτῷ takes away all definitive force. Surely ᾧ ἀπόκειται ("for whom it is reserved," exactly as Job xxxviii. 23 LXX.; nearly as Deut. xxxii. 34 Sym.) will account for all. It would be natural to change ᾧ into οἷ, and so get an actual subject to ἔλθῃ, and then αὐτῷ would be added for clearness; some going further and making better Greek by τὰ ἀποκείμενα αὐτῷ."

On the words: "This hypothesis is supported by the combination, etc.," Dr. Hort comments, "How?"

p. 177 f. (On Isa. xxix. 13.) Dr. Hort thinks that the shortening of the much quoted text may be accounted for more simply by supposing—

(1) That the combination ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ with ἐγγίξει was not understood, and that ἐγγίξει was taken absolutely (as in Justin Martyr, quoted by Dr. Hatch, p. 178);

(2) That ἐν τῷ στόματι was taken with what follows, of which it then seemed to be an otiose repetition; hence the reading of \aleph^A ; and

(3) That the still shorter form was practically derived from the Gospels, aided by the apparent superfluity of ἐγγίζει taken absolutely, as a preface to the following clauses.

Dr. Hort decidedly questions the statement, "some good MSS. of St. Matthew give the longer form," and notes that the Latin quotations are "all detached" (p. 178).

p. 180. (On Ps. xxi. (xxii.) 23.) Dr. Hort notes: "[There is a] confusion with Psalm xxxv. (xxxiv.) 18, 'ἐξομολογήσομαί σοι [Κύριε,] ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ πολλῇ' with the not uncommon ψαλῶ σοι (τῷ Κυρίῳ, τῷ Θεῷ, etc.), and with Psalm lxxxix. (lxxxviii.) 6."

p. 181. The words in Barnabas c. ix., which are adduced as suggesting the existence of psalms breathing the spirit, and adopting the Greek phraseology of the existing Psalms, are regarded by Dr. Hort as an "easy paraphrase" of Psalm xxxiii. (xxxiv.) 13. So too the words in c. xv.

Micah vi. 6: ἐν τίνι καταλάβω τὸν Κύριον may have suggested (Dr. Hort thinks) the ἐν τινι ὀφθήσομαι of c. vi.

Dr. Hort points out that the words ὁσμὴ...αὐτήν cited from c. ii. are from another source cited by Irenæus and Clement, and refers the reader to Harnack.

p. 191. (On the quotation by Justin of Psalm xxi. (xxii.) 3.) On Dr. Hatch's "only recorded instance" of ἀνείαν we find the comment: "A mere misprint of MSS. Dindorf found ἀγνίαν in the Paris MS., as ἀγνείαν in the better Colbert MS.; and points out rightly that the clause has slipped down from the chapter above. Perhaps \aleph^B : in Psalm xlix. (xlviii.) 14, \aleph^B is rendered ἀνοία by Symmachus, ἀνοησία by Aquila."

p. 191. Justin twice quotes Psalm xxiii. (xxiv.) 7 with ἵνα εἰσέλθῃ in the place of the καὶ εἰσελεύσεται of LXX. From this and from the *ut ingrediatur* of Jerome's Psalter, for which Dr. Hatch would conjecture *ut ingrediatur*, he draws the inference that it may be supposed that ἵνα εἰσέλθῃ was "the reading which existed in the recension of the LXX. which was followed not only by Justin but also by the Old Latin versions."

This last remark elicits two notes of admiration: for Tertullian has *et intrabit* and Cyprian *et introibit*, while the *ut ingrediatur* on which Dr. Hatch leans is in Jerome's *Hebrew Psalter*. Dr. Hort

thinks that Justin's *ἴρα εἰσέλθῃ* is “surely a very natural change, apart from the Hebrew; just as some MSS. of Ambrose ‘de Fide,’ i. 525^a, have ‘Crede angelis dicentibus, Et elevamini, portæ æternales, ut introeat in te rex gloriæ, Dominus Sabaoth.’”

p. 192. On Psalm lxxxī. (lxxxii.) 7. Jerome's Psalter is again appealed to as a witness to the text of the LXX. Dr. Hort writes in the margin: “Hebrew Psalter again! and it is a mere matter of punctuation left open by the Latin words.”

p. 193. Dr. Hatch says: “the text in *Trypho* corresponds almost exactly to the Vatican text of the LXX. Psalter.” On this Dr. Hort notes: It “departs eight times from B: once it agrees with B against A, once with A against B.”

p. 194. *l.* 7. “εἰδῶλα is used elsewhere, but *δαιμόνια* is not, as a translation of דַּיְמוֹנִים ” (Hatch). “*δαιμόνια* occurs only in six other places, for five different Hebrew words” (Hort).

ib. (On v. 7.) “A phrase which may be compared with the current philosophical phrase *τῷ πατρὶ τῶν ὄλων*” (Hatch). “Found in Dial. 74, to which Otto refers” (Hort).

p. 196. (On Isa. iii. 10.) Dr. Hort adds: “Notice should have been taken of the borrowing in Sap. ii. 12, where the verb is *ἐνεδρεύσωμεν*.”

p. 197. (On Isa. vii. 10–17.) The “singular reading” in Apol. 33 is “surely only a confused reminiscence of St. Matthew (who has *ἔξει* and *καλέσουσι*), with the additional touch *ἐροῦσιν ἐπί*, *i.e.*, this will be the faith suggested by the name.” And the *καλέσουσι* in Matthew is more probably the source of *ἐροῦσι* in Justin than *vice versa*. The suggestion that this translation of the last clause of the verse (“*ἐροῦσιν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ Μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ Θεός*”) is “a unique survival of a lost targum” is marked ?? by Dr. Hort.

p. 198 contains the following notes. On the statement “*Tryph.* 43 reads *ἀπειθεῖ πονηρά* for the current LXX. reading *ἀπειθεῖ πονηρία*”—“probably a slip only.”

On “*ἀπωθεῖν* is frequently used as the translation of בָּשָׂף , to despise”—“no, only *ἀπωθοῦμαι*, but also three times *ἀπειθέω* [is so used], including an instance from Isaiah (I.)”

On “it is *evident* from Tertullian . . . that the insertion existed,”—“Hardly, only possible; his combination exactly illustrates the scribe's process below” [*i.e.* in the lines which immediately follow].

On "used with *emphasis* in the Judæo-Christian controversy,"—"?? (a middle verse of a long quotation not afterwards referred to)."

At the close of this paragraph Dr. Hort writes, "Nothing is said of the curious *σκληρῶς οἴσεις* for *φοβῆ* in both places."

(*To be continued.*)

"LIBERTY OF THE TREE OF LIFE."

REVELATION II. 7.

II.

"To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the Paradise of God." What is the promise which these words convey? They are popularly thought to refer to a mystical and transcendental state—to a reward which shall be reaped in the world beyond the grave. They are taken to proclaim the existence of a second Paradise, of a new and higher Eden above the clouds and beyond the tomb, where the soul shall be nourished by a bread which the heart of man has not conceived. Now, however true such a doctrine is in itself, I do not think it is the idea of the present passage. I do not think the eyes of the seer of Patmos are here lifted above the present world at all. We have been misled by the phrase "in the midst of the Paradise of God." We commonly take it to mean "the tree which is in heaven." On the contrary, I understand it to signify "the tree which is spoken of in Genesis ii. 9." That the imagery is *built* on Genesis ii. 9 has, of course, never been disputed; but I propose to read the phrase as itself a quotation mark, "unto him that overcometh will I give to eat of that tree which in Genesis ii. 9 is said to be in the midst of the Paradise of God."

The effect of such a rendering is obvious. It removes the notion that the tree of life is something existing in heaven. When we are merely told that we shall be allowed to eat of

that tree which was formerly forbidden to the inhabitants of Eden, we are free to ask, "What was it?" "Where was it?" And it is clear that from this point of view there is no mystery about the answer. The tree of life in the garden of Eden never was in heaven; it was very much indeed upon the earth. It was not only *in* the present world; it was the present world itself in its most outward form. The tree of life was the opposite of the tree of knowledge. It was the spontaneous play of vital energy—energy not turned in upon the brain but turned out upon the world. To have liberty of the tree of life was to have the freedom of eye and ear, of hand and heart, of sense and soul. It was to enjoy life in all its branches, to taste the gladness of being a sentient creature, to feel the mere rapture of living, without counting what life shall bring. And, when the tree is placed in the midst of the garden, it is declared as plainly as words can speak that such liberty is the normal rule. The idea of the writer of Genesis and the idea of the writer of the Apocalypse is one and the same—that there is a physical element which man ought to have and which other things have. The latter author does not scruple to use the phrase "a *right* to the tree of life" (Rev. xxii. 14). He regards the want of it as something which makes man abnormal. To seek it is no presumption, because it is no novelty. The miracle of man is not what he has but what he has not; it is his comparative impotence in that humble field where the humblest are strong. If he is great where other things are lowly, he is lowly where other things are great. In the region of grace he may ask to be *elevated*; in the sphere of nature he desires simply to be reinstated.

Man has, then, according to the Apocalypse, a *right* to the tree of life—to the use of the present world. The ground of that right is the fact that the liberty of the tree has already been conceded in other spheres. That it has been so conceded is manifest. Look at the world of

nature. What is its prevailing voice? It is spontaneity—the absence of all appearance of restraint. The very word "nature" is used as the antithesis of restraining grace. Everything is of course limited to its own sphere, but within that sphere it is free; it is allowed to come up to the door of its natural environment. This impression is so strongly suggested by the physical world that it has everywhere found a voice in poetry. It makes the brook say, "I go on for ever." It initiates the proverb, "as free as the wind." It paints the river wandering "at its own sweet will." And, when we pass to the semi-conscious forms of nature, the impression is deepened. The animal world seems permitted to expend more energy than it requires. The bird would do with less song. The dog would do with less barking. The cattle would do with less lowing. Everywhere and always, the unreflective forms of life seem to move within their own channel without let or hindrance, without cherubim or flaming sword. Their restraints are all from without; they have no limitations in the law of their being.

The first limit arises when we come to man, and to man it comes as a surprise. It is in the world of religion that the interruption occurs to human freedom. When the boy goes to church, he hears for the first time the click of the garden gate—that gate which used to be left open to all footsteps. For the first time he finds pleasure represented, not indeed as something forbidden, but as a thing which ought to be restricted. And, not the least striking feature is the reason for the restriction. It is not made on the ground that certain pleasures are innocent and certain others vicious. It is made on the ground that pleasure itself may come into antagonism with God if one has too much of it. A day is set apart from other days, distinguished by its limitation of outward enjoyments—a day when, over fields that were lawful yesterday, there are

written the words "no trespassing." And, the first sensation of the youth is one of anger. He feels antagonistic to religion. He feels that religion has defrauded him of something which he ought to have. Why should he be denied the freedom which other things enjoy—the freedom of the streams, of the rivers, of the winds? Why should the arrest which is not put to the song of the bird be imposed on the song of a human heart? You tell the youth that the one is a state of nature and the other a state of grace. He will answer, "Then, let me live in nature and avoid grace. Let me not sacrifice my freedom. Let me keep aloof from a religious life which promises me only mutilation, and exacts as the price of heaven the surrender of the earth."

Now, it is on this difficulty that the passage in Revelation throws a flash of light. Does it admit that the religion of Christ imposes a limit on human pleasure? Yes; so far the youth has judged rightly. But it declares that Christianity issues its prohibition for exactly the opposite reason from that which the youth supposes, nay, from that which the Church itself often supposes. The common view is that the restrictions are sent because a full amount of earthly liberty is incompatible with the grace of God. It is here said to be incompatible with the want of it. It is not because we are religious, but because we are not, that the tree is forbidden. The passage, like that in Genesis, is evidently based upon the simile of a child's diet: "To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life." The idea is that the child is unfit for sumptuous living; or, to drop the metaphor, man is said to be denied the liberty of the things of nature because he has not become thoroughly natural. He cannot become equal to other things in naturalness until he has reached that which he supposes to be the enemy of nature—grace. Man is God's youngest child—His delicate child. He possesses a very tender mechanism,

which streams do not possess, and which is very easily put out of order—conscience. It is not enough for this mechanism that it should do nothing wrong; the act of indifference, the abstaining from doing right, is equally prejudicial. Conscience becomes blunted by the use of things *outside* of Christ's kingdom, even though not adverse to that kingdom. Until this delicacy is overcome, until the conscience gets the power to go outside without being hurt, there is no choice but to wall in the garden, no alternative but to place the cherubim and the flaming sword on every side of human nature which would open the liberty of the tree of life.

Now, the question is, how is this weakness in the natural constitution of man to be got rid of? Is there any suggestion in the passage before us of the mode in which it is to be rendered robust and fit for freedom? I think there is. Observe the imagery of the passage. If the disease is represented under the simile of a child in need of spare diet, the cure of the disease is described under the metaphor of a conquering soldier, "he that overcometh." Now, what is the idea involved in conquest? It is the abolition of the distinction between your country and the enemy's country. What is the literal meaning of the English word "overcome"? It is to "come over"—to cross the gulf which divides your land from an opposing land. To conquer or overcome a nation is to make it one with your own, to destroy the middle wall of partition, to obliterate the landmarks on either side, and, if possible, to call the name of the vanquished region by the name of your own conquering land.

Now, this is precisely the thought of the passage before us. The Christian conscience in its incipient stage is hurt by meeting anything outside the kingdom of Christ. The course open is to deny the outsideness. There have been always two extremes in the religious life—the principle of

asceticism and the principle of worldly accommodation. The one advises a withdrawal from the things of earth; the other counsels a little latitude in deference to the weakness of humanity. The gospel of Christ, as understood by this passage, is radically different from either of these. It refuses, on the one hand, to withdraw itself from the world; it repudiates, on the other, the idea of worldly accommodation. What remains? What path is left for a religion which will neither consent to be imprisoned within itself nor yet agree to admit the forms of the world? One path alone is left for it—conquest. It must claim the world as a bit of its own property. It must come over the gulf that divides it from other things. It must annul the separation between the secular and the sacred. It must say with the writer of Revelation himself, in sublime illustration of his own principle, "The kingdoms of this world have become the kingdom of our God and of His Christ."

It will be seen that this gospel of Christ, with all its liberality, leaves room for asceticism, nay, as a preliminary stage, demands asceticism. There is a time in which man is not allowed to eat of the tree. He is kept upon manna until he is ripe for the old corn of the land. The day in which he is permitted to pass over the border is the day in which he overcomes the contrast between Christ and the world—in which he can say with Paul, "If I am Christ's, all things are mine." The test of his fitness to cross the border is his power to say, to feel this. The liberty which a Christian claims is not claimed by him on the ground that certain objects are innocent and harmless. To a frivolous mind no pleasure is innocent; the want of character simply feeds the frivolity. The Christian claim of liberty rests on the opposite ground—the ground that a mind full of Christ must impart Christ to everything, that a heart imbued with love must see everywhere the object of its love, that a spirit impregnated with the music of God

must hear even in the rolling of a railway train the rhythm of that music. That is the thought on which the right to Christian freedom is based, and every worldly pursuit is tested by its conformity to that thought. Let us look from this point of view at one or two branches of the tree of life.

And, let us begin with the world of art. When Christianity first came to earth, its votaries despised art. They did so because they thought it heathen, *i.e.*, sensuous, and therefore fitted to withdraw men from the study of the soul. And so the first Christians separated themselves from art and shunned the sight of an image; they felt themselves forbidden to touch this branch of the tree. And so they were—but not through anything in the tree. As Paul would say, they were "straitened in their own affections." Their Christ was not commensurate with the world—did not yet fill all things; and they were right to abstain. But now, suppose a man should come to a different conclusion. Suppose he should arrive at the conviction that art, instead of being sensuous, is the proof that the spirit can shine through the sense. Suppose he should look upon it as the evidence that the actual forms of life are unable to imprison the spirit of beauty. Imagine, in short, that he came to regard art as itself a protest in favour of a new heaven and a new earth, of a beauty more unblemished and a symmetry more flawless. What would be the effect of such a state of mind? It would clearly be an extension of the boundaries of the religious world. It would confer on the man a right to cross the border, to incorporate the domain of art in the sphere of religion. Instead of being a barrier to Christ, he would come to recognise it as practically a search for Christ. It would be to him an attempt to figure in the mind and to express by the hand an ideal which is suggested by, and yet transcends the visible. It would be an aspiration towards the resurrection of the body, towards a larger and higher physical

development in which the outward life of man shall approximate more nearly to the standard of the soul.

Let us pass from art to fiction. The reading of fiction has often been a reproach in the religious world. It has not been on the ground that there are many immoral novels. It has been based on the fact that they *are* novels, and therefore a waste of time. It is asked why, with so many earnest realities around them, men should spend voluntary hours over that which is a dream. How are we to meet this objection? Shall we say that we must have some relaxation from the earnest business of life? That is quite a natural desire. But is it a claim to liberty? If I ask permission to read a novel on the plea that the flesh is weak, I am asking, not a right, but an act of grace; I am claiming, not the charter of a free-born man, but the charity of a beggar. If I am to have a right to this branch of the tree, it must be for a different reason. And there is such a reason forthcoming. There may come to me a time in which a very ideal novel may be to me the most real thing in the world, more real than anything which men call actual. That time shall come whenever I recognise Christ to be a reality. The moment I say to myself, “There is a beauty which eye has not seen nor ear heard nor natural mind conceived,” I have set up a claim to the Christian reading of that which men call fiction. I have claimed it on the ground, not of the weakness of the flesh, but of the strength of the spirit. I have asserted my right to this branch of the tree. I have done so on the principle that the gospel of Christ has revealed to me the absolute reality of all heroism that transcends the earth. In reading of a high heroism which I have not seen in actual life I do not feel that I am wasting my time in unreality. On the contrary, I am turning from the unreal to the real, from the imperfect to the perfect, from the prophecy to the fulfilment, from the

temporal shadow to the eternal substance. The Christian is by nature a worshipper of things not seen as yet. He is a believer in the existence of a star which lies beyond the range of the telescope. Is it surprising that he should be prepared to welcome the record of that which is above experience, and accept by the eye of faith an order of human things which the eye of sense as yet cannot discern?

The only remaining instance I shall notice of the relation between Christian life and Christian liberty is the set of actions comprehended under the general word "pleasure." The common view is that when a man becomes a Christian the thing called worldly pleasure is there and then lessened to him in value. The Christian position is exactly the reverse. It is that the possession of Christ for the first time makes pleasure possible. The doctrine of Christianity is that the root of all earthly happiness is self-forgetfulness. "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all other things shall be added unto you," are the words in which the law of pleasure is declared. The petition, "Thy will be done," precedes the prayer, "Give us this day our daily bread." Nor is it without reason that it does so. It is a matter of the most everyday experience that "he who loveth his life shall lose it." Fix your mind upon the personal joy which any pleasure shall bring you, dwell on it night and day, cherish it hour by hour, and the result will inevitably be disappointment. Pleasure will not stand to be scrutinised; it must come in at the side door. Its most successful moments are its most forgetful moments. It is not the fact of anticipation which disqualifies; it is the anticipation for one's self. Figure in advance the pleasure, not which will come to you, but which will come to another, and the result will be quite different; it will come into your own bosom "pressed down, and shaken, and running over." The Christian has for the first time

received the organ of joy, the sense by which pleasure can be known. He has the right to pleasure which comes from the possession of the faculty—the right which the eye has to see, which the ear has to hear, which the heart has to feel. He has got back the liberty of nature because he has himself for the first time become natural—acquired all the organs for physical enjoyment. He has entered into the pleasure of natural things because he has entered into their spontaneity. He has overcome the tendency to self-consciousness which is the death of happiness. He has ceased to say we shall be “as gods, knowing good and evil.” It is the thought of being like gods that expels Paradise from the eyes, that stops the flow of the rivers, that withers the foliage of the trees. The overcoming of my own shadow restores the banished light, and the spontaneity of a sacrificial soul unbars my way to that play of energy which belongs by nature to created things.

GEORGE MATHESON.

CHRIST'S ATTITUDE TO HIS OWN DEATH.

IV.

WHAT we have hitherto attempted to understand and define has been Christ's *prophetic* attitude to His own death, and we may now add that its most remarkable characteristic is its objectivity. If He has not conceived and described it as if it were another's death rather than His own, yet He has even in His most inward moments thought of it with a certain detachment of mind; and has represented it more as an idea He had imaged than as an experience He had undergone. In other words, His attitude to it was rather intellectual than emotional, more historical than personal, more that of one who saw than of Him who suffered. This was inevitable, and expresses one of those limitations which

so define and authenticate His humanity. To *foresee* may be to *forefeel*, but in idea rather than in reality, more through sympathy than by experience; and however perfect the foresight, the reality must needs be richer and mightier than the idea, the experience more vivid and keen than the sympathy. Jesus was no mere objective intellect, as it were a conscious mirror in which the fugitive phenomena of His time were reflected for co-ordination and interpretation; but He was a beautiful and sensitive soul, which the things it touched could thrill with pleasure or sting with pain. Hence, when death came to Him as an experience, it could not but be to His consciousness quite another thing than it had seemed to be as a mere idea or expectation; and it was these new elements in the concrete reality which made death for Him so bitter, or, as He named it to His captors, "Your hour and the power of darkness."¹ And so the discussion as to His prophetic mind must be supplemented and completed by the analysis of His consciousness as He stood face to face with death.

I.

In order that we may connect the new discussion with the old, we must here note and distinguish the two principal positions in His prophetic speech,—viz. (1) How He conceived His death; (2) How He described its circumstances and mode. As to the first, He affirmed His death to be necessary yet voluntary, redemptive and therefore vicarious (*ἀντὶ πολλῶν*), a sacrifice in which He shed His blood in order to the remission of sins, the ratifying of the new covenant, and the organization of the new society. As to the second, He represents His death as the work of "the elders and chief priests," who were to "deliver Him up to the Gentiles to be crucified." Now between these two positions there is something more than an apparent contradiction.

¹ Luke xxii. 53.

If His death was voluntary, the free surrender of His life "as a ransom for many," how could it be the work, on the one hand, of "the elders and chief priests," and, on the other, of the Romans? The anomaly seems to be increased by the difference in His language and temper when He defines the idea and function of His death, and when He describes its circumstances and mode. In the former case He speaks of it as a beneficent work, spontaneously undertaken and graciously fulfilled; in the latter case He speaks of it as an evil deed, guiltily attempted and accomplished. But how can the one character belong to the death, and the other to the acts and process by which it is realized? The discussion of these questions involves important issues both for the history of the Passion and for its theological interpretation.

A. It may simplify the discussion if we begin by making a very obvious distinction—the worth or merit of the death, *i.e.*, the quality by virtue of which it could redeem, consisted in the will and dignity of the sufferer, not in the circumstances and mode of His death. Its essence or intrinsic quality was strictly personal to Him; what belonged to its form and manner was accidental and occasional. The wooden cross, with all its hideous accessories, the pierced hands and feet, the wounded side, the howling mob, the mocking priests, the vacillating Roman, the sentinel soldiers, the blistering sun under whose pitiless heat the crucified thirsts and faints and dies—these are not the unholy, but essential ritual of this unique sacrifice, the acts, instruments and modes without which its substance could not be. Jesus Himself never spoke as if they were; it was not man's action, least of all theirs whose hands crucified Him, but His own will, which made His death a sacrifice. The cross to Him was not two transverse bars of wood, but an inward experience so unspeakable as to need a cruel and horrible sign for its expression.

The cause of His suffering was so indescribable as to require for its representation the symbology that, while embodied in human conduct, yet spoke above all things known to man of mean and inveterate devilry, viz., the priest who ought to stand for the holiness of God, turned into the minister of sin; and the judge who is charged to be the guardian of innocence, made into the instrument of guilt. But while He recognises the form as inevitable, He never conceives it as essential; all that is of the essence is His own pure contribution. Men contribute the accidents which make the essence live to the imagination, the forms which enable it to overawe the conscience and make its appeal to the heart.

B. The relation, however, between the essence and the accidents has not been allowed to continue as He conceived it. There is a great distinction between the morbid and the pious imagination, for while the latter always seeks by assimilating the form to the matter to purify and exalt religion, the former tends by accommodating the matter to the form to coarsen and deprave it. The pious imagination is ethical, the morbid is sensuous; the one is satisfied only when religion has the apparel of light and the adornment of the graces, but the other is pleased only when spiritual ideas are grossly, if not carnally, embodied. Now the Passion is the field where the morbid imagination has most disastrously performed its metamorphic feats. The apostolic writings exhibit, whenever they touch the sufferings of the Saviour, the most marvellous reticence. They speak of His condescension, grace, love; His beautiful renunciation of self in assuming the likeness of man and humbling Himself to the death of the cross; they speak, though but rarely, of the wickedness or the ignorance of the men who "crucified the Lord of glory," but they indulge in no ghastly details. What appealed to their imagination was what He did for man, not the marks

which He bore on His body of blood-red human hands. And the sub-apostolic remained as the apostolic age, absorbed in the contemplation of His grace rather than of His physical agonies. The oldest Christian art shows how long this lucid sanity of imagination survived. In the oldest attempts to represent Him in the Roman catacombs or the Eastern basilicas, He appears in four distinct characters. First, as the Good Shepherd, bearing in His arms a lamb, or even, as Matthew Arnold so finely told us, as if in answer to Tertullian's unputting sentence,

“He saves the sheep, the goats He doth not save,”

carrying on His shoulders a kid. Secondly, as the young yet sage teacher, sitting amid His disciples and distributing the pure and peaceable wisdom which is from above. Thirdly, as the immortal youth radiant with the beauty which years cannot lessen or care deface. Fourthly, as the Lord of life breathing His own imperishable energy into the dead man whom He brings forth from the tomb. These are the fit symbols of a society which was conscious of having become, through the condescension of the Eternal, a sharer in the eternal life. But in the darker days that followed the sense of the immortal life faded, and the feeling of mortal weakness took its place. Asceticism invaded the Church, the body was hypostatized, made the seat of sin, the abode of the lusts which bring forth death. To please the body was to offend God; to punish the body, to do penance by means of fasting and physical pain, was to be acceptable to Him. And what God approved in the Christian He had received in an infinite degree from Christ; the death which He had accepted as an atonement for human sin was a death of superlative suffering, supreme as a sacrifice because pre-eminent in its bodily anguish. This mediæval idea, where the accidents of the Passion have become its very essence, created mediæval art. The ancient masters

were good painters, but bad theologians, and their art was most marvellous where their theology was most miserable. They made the most hideous subjects seem majestic, and forced the fastidious imagination to feel æsthetic pleasure in the contemplation of the painful, or even the horrible. They studied the agonies of the dying, the livid lineaments, the rigid limbs and emaciated frame of the dead, the horrors of the dissecting-room and the gallows, that they might the more realistically depict the Saviour bearing the cross or on the cross, being taken down from the cross or prepared for burial, entombed or rising from the tomb. And what was so enshrined in art was enfixed in thought; men could not escape from those dismal images of Christ, which met them everywhere, faced them in their worship, surrounded them in their hours of devotion, so possessed their eyes and imaginations that they could think of the Passion under no other terms than those thus prescribed and determined. The painter may be a subtler, an even more permanent and penetrative force in theology than the divine; and when he uses all the resources of his art to glorify the morbid and idealize the horrible, he becomes, in the very degree that his art is great, a mischievous and deteriorative force in religion. We should, but for the transcendent influence of the old masters, have long since outgrown the debased oriental heathenism which has made our idea of the Passion little else than the apotheosis of all, whether in dying or in death, that is most shocking to man and most divisive from God.

II.

In order that we may transcend this vulgar and carnal point of view, we must return to our analysis of the mind of Jesus.

A. And here reverting to the distinction between His idea of His death and His foresight of its circum-

stances and mode, we have to note a correspondent and characteristic difference in His mental attitude. From the idea of death He never shrinks; He contemplates it calmly, speaks of it with the serene dignity of one who knew that the most tragic moment of His life was at once the supreme choice of His will and the real end of His being. But when He thinks of the mode and agents, His feeling changes, and His speech is charged now with monition and judgment, now with pity and regret. This difference is recognised both by the Synoptists and by John. By the Synoptists He is shown as speaking of the positive fact and function of His death only when His mood is most exalted, or when He is most moved by love and pity, or when He least feels the shadow of human hate and feels most the clinging trust or blind yet kindly fellowship of His disciples. But when He thinks of the men and means by which it is to be accomplished, His language rings with another tone; the men are the wicked husbandmen, or the foolish builders; they are "blind guides," "hypocrites," who crucify the living prophet, and build the sepulchres of the prophets long dead. The city they rule so moves His compassion that at the sight of it He weeps. The traitor is a man of so woeful a fate that He had better never have been born. And so while of death in relation to Himself He thinks and speaks with benignant grace, the thought of its manner begets in Him shame and something akin to dismay.

In John the difference is even more strongly accentuated. He speaks of His death in language that would on other lips suggest rapture. It was His own act, the thing He had come by command of the Father expressly to do.¹ It was the hour in which "the Son of Man should be glorified."² By death He was to "be lifted up from the earth," and would "draw all men unto Himself."³ But the sanc-

¹ x. 18.

² xii. 23-27.

³ *Ib.* xvii. 1, 33.

tity of the death does not sanctify the instruments by which it is realized. On the contrary the traitor acts by inspiration of Satan.¹ The Jews are like their father the devil, who was "a murderer from the beginning,"² and this was said because He knew that they "sought to kill Him."³

B. We have, then, even in the prophetic period these two very different, but not at all incompatible, elements in the consciousness of Jesus. His sacred joy or spiritual exaltation in the prospect of death and His horror at the form in which, and the forces through which, it was to come to Him. But now we must advance a step further, and study His spirit as it suffers in the hands of those forces whose action He had foreseen. And here we shall have constant need to remember the distinction between experience and foresight, for the evil the intellect watches is sweet when compared with the infinite bitterness of the evil which the soul may feel. What we have then to attempt to describe is the transition of the Saviour's mind from the objective contemplation of the death He was to die to His subjective experience of the powers by which it was to be accomplished.

The incident which exhibits this transition is the scene in Gethsemane. Now, of all the events in the Saviour's life this seems to me to demand the most reverent handling; for it is, as it were, the very Holy of Holies, the inmost sanctuary of His sorrow, which ought to be entered only at those moments when thought has been purged from the pride and impurities of life. But the scholar is often more curious than reverent, yet in sacred things the irreverent is near of kin to the blind; and as it is so easy to be unfit for its interpreter, few incidents have been more utterly misunderstood than this. It is not surprising that Celsus should have explained the scene as due to Christ's

¹ xiii. 27.

² viii. 44.

³ vii. 1.

fear of death;¹ or that Julian should have pitied Him as a miserable mortal unable to bear His fate calmly;² or that a modern pagan like Vanini on his way to the scaffold should have pointed to a crucifix, and said: "Illi in extremis prae timore imbellis sudor: ego imperterritus morior."³ Nor are we surprised that the older Rationalists should regard it as the effect of a purely physical cause—fear due to bodily exhaustion and indisposition;⁴ or that Baur should see in it only an event that enabled him to play the Synoptists off against John and John against the Synoptists;⁵ or that Strauss, holding the narrative for more poetical than historical, should have mythically decomposed it in his first Life,⁶ and followed in his second Baur's antithetical criticism to its issue in a prosaic naturalism;⁷ or that Renan, true to his Parisian sentimentality, should conceive it as a moment when human nature reawoke in Jesus, and He felt enfeebled, if not affrighted, at the vision before Him of the death which was to end all, and the vision behind of the clear springs of Galilee and the fair maidens who visited them.⁸ But we are surprised that Keim should see in it the human dread of death holding Christ back from His destiny,⁹ that Schleiermacher should lose all sense of its sublime significance in a hypercritical analysis of the possible sources of its details,¹⁰ or that Neander should see Him here asking, as a man, to be spared the sufferings that awaited Him.¹¹ But bad as these explanations are,

¹ *Contra Cels.*, lib. ii., c. xxiv.

² *Apud Theod. Mops.*, in *Ev. Lucæ Com. Frag.*; *Pat. Gr.*, T. lxvi. p. 724.

³ Grammondus, *Hist. Gall. ab. ex. Hen. IV.*, lib. iii. pp. 211. seqq.; cf. Brucker, *Historia Philos.*, T. iv., pars 11, pp. 677–8.

⁴ Paulus, *Das Leben Jesu*, ii. pp. 202–210.

⁵ *Untersuch. über die Kanon. Evang.*, pp. 198 ff., 207, 265 f.

⁶ *Life of Jesus* (4th ed.), §§ 125, 126.

⁷ *New Life*, § 87.

⁸ *Vie de Jésus*, p. 378 (7th ed.).

⁹ *Jesus of Nazara*, vi. p. 12.

¹⁰ *Das Leben Jesu*, pp. 422–4. Cf. *Essay on the Gospel of St. Luke*, pp. 300–1.

¹¹ *Life of Christ*, § 230.

some of those we owe to more orthodox theologians are worse. Steinmeyer thinks that Jesus here may have taken upon His shoulders the sin of the world in order that He might, vicariously, make atonement for it on the Cross.¹ Long before him Calvin had here seen Jesus as our substitute, burdened with our sins, bearing the wrath of God with the judgment-seat before His eyes.² More reasonable was Ambrose, who saw Jesus sorrowful not for His own, but for man's state: "Tristis erat, non pro sua passione, sed pro nostra dispersione."³ But possibly even more reasonable was the elder Dumas when he represented the agony as a second temptation, in which the devil tried to drive Christ back from His work by three successive visions, the last and most terrible being the persecution by the Church of the heretics, their heresy being often their higher saintliness. These selections from a multitude of elaborately argued opinions are enough to show how hard it has been to seize the real significance of this awful moment in the history of our Saviour's Passion.

III.

How then is the agony to be interpreted?

A. We assume its reality and the authenticity of the Synoptic narrative.⁴ John does not give it, but the attitude and state of mind it expresses were not unknown to him.⁵ Luke differs in certain details from Matthew and Mark—the angel which strengthens Him, the sweat "as it were great drops of blood falling down to the ground," and the omission of the thrice-repeated prayer; but the differences are mainly noticeable for this—Luke, by the angel and the sweat of blood, and Matthew and Mark, by the three-

¹ *Leidensgesch. des Herrn*, pp. 62 ff.

² *Harm. Evang.*, Matt. xxvi. 37.

³ *Expos. Ev. sec. Lucam*, lib. x. § 61.

⁴ Matt. xxvi. 36-46; Mark xiv. 32-42; Luke xxii. 39, 40.

⁵ John xii. 27.

fold resort to prayer, express the same thing—the intensity of the strain, the deadly nature of the struggle. Now, it is evident that the Evangelists did not regard the narrative as representing anything so commonplace and even vulgar as the fear of death. They had told, with many a touch of unconscious truth, how the disciples had refused to see the approach of its inexorable foot while He had looked upon it with serene and open face; and, simple as they were, they could not have mistaken the meaning of so sudden a reversal of mental attitude. Not that horror at death in Jesus would have been either an unseemly or an inexplicable thing. Contempt of life is the obverse, indifference to death is the reverse of the same mind. The more excellent the good of life seems, the more terrible will appear its negation; and it might well have been that the soul which of all souls most possessed the good should have most loved life, and most have feared its darksome ending. But the feeling, though explicable in itself, will not fit into the history. The death so often anticipated, so solemnly sanctioned, so formally blessed, could not be thus met. The higher we place its significance for Jesus, the less can we construe it as the cause of His agony; for this agony must stand in organic connexion with His expressed mind, not in violent contradiction to it. If so, then it is evident that the antecedent of the agony was not the idea of death, but the feeling as to its means and agents. His death was to be for sin, but at the hands of sinners, yet of sinners disguised as “elders and chief priests,” as disciples and judges. In foresight the mode of death was subordinate to the idea, but in experience the idea tended to be lost in the emotions which the mode awakened. How this was the history tells. In Galilee the men who were to effect His death were mere names to Him; in Jerusalem the names became men. They were the priests, who stood for all that the worship of God signified; the elders, who were in symbol the

people of God; the magistrates, who guarded freedom, enforced law, and typified right; the disciple, who had heard and followed Him, and

“Lived in His mild and magnificent eye.”

Behind the actual persons He thus saw ideal figures stand; and if the ideal signified what ought to have been, it was the actual which, by its inevitable working, determined His all too bitter experience. To see it stand in the holy place was bad enough, it was worse to feel that it stood there to oppose all that was of God in Himself. And worst of all was the discovery that evil had found a foothold and embodiment in the society He Himself had selected and trained. We must not overlook the influence which the conduct of Judas would exercise on the mind of the Master. Jesus as He entered the garden carried a double memory: the gracious dream of the supper, and the lurid image of the traitor. From the very nature of the case, the more bitter would for the moment be the more potent feeling; for where the soul is so susceptible and tense, the painful strikes more deeply than the agreeable. And Gethsemane represents the struggle of Jesus with the new problem which thus came before His imagination personified in Judas and the priests, and which He had to solve in the very face, if not in the very article, of death.

B. Let us try now to conceive clearly what this new problem was. Jesus was holy, and felt as only the sinless can the stain of sin burn like a living fire upon His soul. He had conceived Himself as a Redeemer by the sacrifice of Himself, as a Saviour by death. But now, when He comes face to face with this death, what does He find? That sin has taken occasion from His very grace to become more exceedingly sinful, to mix itself up with His sacrifice, penetrating and effacing it, transmuting it from a free and gracious act into a violent and necessitated

death. His act of redemption becomes as it were the opportunity for sin to increase. The thing He most hates seems to become a partner with Him in the work He most loves, contributing to its climax and consummation. Or if not so conceived, it must be conceived under a still more dreadful form, as forcing itself into His way, taking possession of His work, turning it into "a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence," a means of creating sinners while it had been intended to save from sin. And there was an even more intolerable element in the situation: the men who were combining to effect this death were persons He was dying to save, and by their action they were making the saving a matter more infinitely hard, more vastly improbable, and changing the cause efficient of salvation into a sufficient reason for judgment.

Is it possible to exaggerate the suffering which such a problem at such a moment must have caused? He could not turn back without being defeated by His horror of this transcendent evil, and He could not go forward without feeling that He was almost compelling it to be. And so first seclusion, then solitude, become to Him a necessity. The society that had made the Supper sacred becomes intolerable; *then* He had something to give which made Him happy, while it consoled and satisfied the disciples; *now* He wanted to receive and could not, for they did not understand what to give and why He suffered. So He leaves them that He may pray alone, yet pauses, and turns to take Peter, James, and John, the three who seemed to know Him best and love Him most. But they are as irresponsive as the dumb soul which speaks no word the human ear can hear, because it has no ear which human speech can reach. So He turns to God in what we may almost describe as His despair. Thrice He prays in an agony of spirit which becomes an agony of body; but even in the midst of the anguish that will not be controlled, He remains master of His will, com-

pels it, even while all His nature seems to resist, to be not submissive but obedient, to accept not its own impulse, but God's wisdom as its law. The thing He would not do, is what His own nature abhors, but the thing He will do because He must, is what God requires. He feels the position as it lives in the place and the moment, but God sees the universal and the eternal issues within it; and so in spite of the noble and justified resistance of the flesh, the spirit obeys the wisdom that cannot err. The conflict is over, and He goes to a death which is at one and the same moment the world's redemption and the world's crime.

C. I feel the temerity and presumption in so thinking, and still more in thus writing, about so solemn a moment in the most august of all lives. But it is humbly offered as a contribution to the understanding of His mind in relation to His own death. There has been no effort made at any doctrinal construction of the agony, nay, I feel as if the intellect, in analytically handling the Passion, would become little else than profane. I may say, however, that the very last thing I could bring myself to do is to apply legal fictions or judicial processes to the mind and state of the Saviour in Gethsemane. Everything here seems to me superlatively real, in the last and highest degree actual. And the reality in this stage of the Passion concerns His relation not to the Father, but to destiny and death. From death as such He does not shrink, but from its mode and agencies, from death under the form and conditions which involve its authors in what appears inexpiable guilt, His whole nature recoils. And this recoil compels us to see that we must divide asunder His part and man's; in what He contributes there is saving efficacy, in what man contributes there is a guilt which causes shame, and becomes a reproach to all mankind. And here one may find some small part of the reason why His prayer for release could not be granted. The cross has in a perfectly real sense done more than

any other agency to convince the world of sin; one may say it has created in man, both as person and as race, the conscience for sin. It stands not simply as the symbol of the grace that saves, but of the wickedness that dared attempt to extinguish the grace. And another thing may be added. While He had to drink the cup, it would not be quite correct to say that His prayer was not answered. For He did not pray in vain. The author of *Hebrews* says, "He was heard for His godly fear."¹ Jesus died on the cross, but not of the cross. He suffered crucifixion, but He was not crucified. The will which triumphed in the conflict broke the heart which could not bear to endure death at the hands of sinners. And this brings us to the conclusion that the death which redeems was all the work of the Redeemer; and not at all of the men who might sin against His grace but could not sin away His mercy, or deprive Him of the splendid privilege of giving Himself "a ransom for many."

A. M. FAIRBAIRN.

MOSES AT THE BATTLE OF REPHIDIM.

"Then came Amalek, and fought with Israel in Rephidim. And Moses said unto Joshua, Choose us out men, and go out, fight with Amalek: to-morrow I will stand on the top of the hill with the rod of God in mine hand. So Joshua did as Moses had said to him, and fought with Amalek: and Moses, Aaron and Hur went up to the top of the hill. And it came to pass, when Moses held up his hand, that Israel prevailed: and when he let down his hand, Amalek prevailed. But Moses' hands were heavy; and they took a stone, and put it under him, and he sat thereon; and Aaron and Hur stayed up his hands, the one on the one side, and the other on the other side; and his hands were steady until the going down of the sun. And Joshua discomfited Amalek and his people with the edge of the sword."—EXODUS xvii. 8-13.

STUDENTS have always been at considerable pains to explain the meaning and efficacy of the lifting up of the hands of Moses during the battle which Israel fought against

¹ v. 9.

Amalek at Rephidim. The opinion¹ that the lifting up of the hand, or rather hands,² is here equivalent to the exercise of military command during the fight may be dismissed without much discussion. The office of Moses was mainly that of a teacher and prophet, and not that of commander on the battlefield. He no doubt planned and personally superintended the military training and warlike preparations of his people, but at times of actual fight he appears to have been in the habit of delegating the military command to a capable and trusted officer who understood the master's plan well, and was possessed of the necessary prowess and strength. In the present case, the transference of the captaincy to Joshua is distinctly mentioned; for the words, "Choose us out men, and go out, fight with Amalek" (v. 9), can hardly be taken to imply anything short of Joshua's appointment to the supreme military command during the action that was then imminent. It is also clear that for the guidance of a fighting host the steady uplifting of the hand would mean nothing, and that for purposes of command one should expect the directing hand to be in more or less frequent motion.

Another view that has been formulated is that Moses in lifting up his hands at the same time held aloft the rod of God which he was in the habit of carrying with him on important occasions, and which is specially mentioned in the eighth verse of the passage under consideration. It has been thought that the lifting up of the wondrous staff had the effect of bringing down heaven's help upon Israel's

¹ For the references to the various views held on the subject, see Dillmann and Keil and Delitzsch *in loco*.

² In accordance with the reading of the LXX., Onkelos and the Peshitta. It may be added, however, that יד appears to be used here for the "arm and the hand" together. The Ḳāmūs mentions this usage for the word in Arabic, and terms like אֲצִילוֹת יָדָי, arm-pits (Jer. xxxviii. 12), and זַרְעֵי יָדָיו, "the arms of his hands (?)" (Gen. xlix. 24), and יָדָיו כְּבִדִים "and Moses' hands (?) were heavy," in verse 12 of the present passage, make such a view imperative in Hebrew.

host to the discomfiture of the army of Amalek. But it is difficult to accept this rather magic explanation of the great incident which we are trying to bring as near to our understanding as possible. A mechanical act like this does not—however much wonderfulness one may attach to it—seem to harmonize with the seriousness of the deadly struggle that was being carried on at the foot of the hill on which Moses and his two companions had taken up their watchful position.

The situation appears to become more intelligible, if we agree with the more commonly accepted view according to which the lifting up of Moses' hand was the outward expression of deep and earnest prayer on behalf of the people whom, under supreme Divine command, he was leading from Egypt towards Canaan. The rod may indeed have occupied one conspicuous position or another during the incident which we are considering, but it would be much easier to imagine that the great instrument of Israel's victory was the fervent and unceasing intercession of their great leader rather than the holding up of the wonder-working staff.

It cannot, however, be said that even this explanation is quite satisfactory. If the efficacy of intercessory prayer had been the main purport of the lifting up of the hand, one should have expected a mention of the act of prayer¹ in one form or another. The absence of any such expression in the narrative makes it very likely that the holding up of Moses' hands had some other great significance, although the intercessory lifting up of the prophet's soul to God must be allowed to have formed a very important part in the total energy implied in the raising aloft of his hands in the position which he occupied on the hill overlooking the battle-field below.

¹ The "spreading out" (פָּרֵץ) of the hands is indeed in various places an accompaniment of prayer, but in all such cases the act of prayer is made clear in the context.

The truth appears to be that the lifting up of Moses' hands during the action of Rephidim signified and effectually represented the full strength and energy of the people of Israel in its deadly conflict with the opposing hosts of the Amalekites. Moses, with his hands perseveringly held up on the hill overlooking the fighting scene, is to be regarded as the full embodiment of his people's power. This explanation may at first sight appear fanciful, and it may also be thought that there is something mystical in such a view of the incident. But I think that a realisation of the whole event, together with a proper appreciation of the relation of Moses to the people he was leading from bondage to freedom, will make the case much clearer to us. The position of Moses is almost—if not entirely—unique in the history of the nations. An abjectly enslaved people owed to him the glorious re-awakening of their race and the inauguration of their national independence. He found them in dire bondage, and he made them free; he found them broken-hearted and in "anguish of spirit," and he breathed into them new hope and fresh courage; he found their great and ancient traditions almost forgotten amongst them, and he revived the glory of their past before their eyes with a view to the opening out of greater glories in the years to come; he found the original Yahveh¹ worship of their ancestors almost entirely in abeyance in the house of their bondage, and he breathed into their souls the inspiration of the true God with which he had been filled himself. Under the influence of this new strength and new freedom he succeeded in rescuing them from the hand of their oppressor, in breaking the power of the Egyptians pur-

¹ I am aware of treading here on delicate ground, as the subject still requires much clearing up; but the thesis maintained in this paper is in no way dependent on this particular statement (to which, however, I am ready to adhere).

suing them with the multitude of their chariots and their sharp-edged weapons of destruction, and in advancing them several stages in their journey towards the land of freedom and the goal of glory. At the time in which the narrative of the battle of Rephidim falls, they were marching fast towards the mountain of Sinai, where the moral and spiritual covenant between the Lord their God and themselves was to be concluded. This covenant was destined to be their great charter of true glory before the nations of the world, and in the fulfilment of the moral obligations then laid upon them they were to find their sure pledge of Divine protection and unconquerable strength. But just before the realisation of this great event, there arose against the marching tribes of Israel a warlike people which tried to cut off their new-born hope, and to destroy their as yet undeveloped strength. It was the first serious encounter after their escape from the Egyptians which the Israelites had to meet. In this great crisis Moses was naturally the person to whom the whole people, as one man, looked for support and guidance. In him, as the messenger of their God, as their deliverer from captivity, and as their great moral and spiritual hero, were all their hopes centred. Now he must either secure for them a glorious conquest, or perish with the hosts which he had undertaken to lead. On his personal power depended the destiny of the whole race. If he can support Israel with the power of the God who was inspiring him, all is well; but if not, all is not at an end, and there would be no Sinai, no ark of the covenant, no marching on to a destiny of glory, and no Divine ordinances pointing to great spiritual realities beyond. All look to Moses, and the prophet of God is not looked to in vain. There is power and great significance in the words he addresses to his faithful and trustful Joshua: "Choose us out men, and go out, fight with Amalek: to-

morrow I will stand on the top of the hill with the rod of God in mine hand." In these words is contained a clear forecast of the result of the impending battle. Girded with strength, Moses took his stand on the hill overlooking the field of action. In his uplifted hands was centred all the strength of his God-inspired soul. The fighting hosts of Israel knew this, felt this. The strength of Moses was their strength. The man who had led them out of the land of Egypt, and who had undertaken to prepare them for great destinies, is all himself. In the steadfastness of his strength was firmly rooted the people's strength. He, Yahveh's tower of energy in their midst, is true and firm; and the heart of Israel, therefore, fainteth not, but is strong with strength unconquerable. In the moments during which spasms of weakness came over the leader, a slight faintness seemed also to fall over all whose minds were fixed on him; but the frequent recurrence of such moments of relaxation was guarded against by the support of two other men who, like Joshua, were closely and intimately associated with Moses in the spiritual energy with which he was invested. With Joshua leading the tribes of Israel to battle, and with Moses supported by Aaron and Hur on the adjacent hill, Israel could only win; and the result of the day's action justified the plan adopted. "And it came to pass, when Moses held up his hand, that Israel prevailed: and when he let down his hand Amalek prevailed. But Moses' hands were heavy; and they took a stone, and put it under him, and he sat thereon; and Aaron and Hur stayed up his hands, the one on the one side, and the other on the other side; and his hands were steady until the going down of the sun. And Joshua discomfited Amalek and his people with the edge of the sword."

I have been trying to describe the event which we are considering in such a manner as to bring the scene and the

mental energy of the persons concerned as close to ourselves as possible; and it will no doubt be felt as a "bathos" if I now invite the reader's attention to an examination of the linguistic facts connected with the term "holding up the hand." The treatment of the subject before us, however, makes such an enquiry absolutely necessary, and this comparatively dull part of the task must, therefore, now be entered upon.

The idea expressed by the phrase, "uplifting of the hand," is analogous to the conception indicated by the "uplifting of the horn," which is best known by its usage in the Psalms, but is also found twice in the Song of Hannah (1 Sam. ii.) and once in Lamentations ii. 17. But whilst the latter is mainly used of exaltation following a successful struggle of one kind or another (see especially 1 Sam. ii. 1), the former is employed to indicate the consciousness of prevailing superior strength during the struggle itself. The "lifting up of the head" which (with the same verb: ירום) occurs three times in the Old Testament (Psa. iii. 4, xxvii. 6, cx. 7) would appear to have more in common with the raising up of the horn than of the hand. But, however this may be, the special force of the phrase with which we are mainly concerned in this place is perfectly clear. In Exodus xiv. 8 we have: ובני ישראל יצאים ביד רמה, "for the children of Israel went out with a high hand," *i.e.*, with prevailing consciousness of power; and the same expression is repeated in Numbers xxxiii. 3. In Micah v. 8 we read: תרם ירך על-צריך, "Let thine hand be lifted up above thine adversaries," and similar phrases are found in Isaiah xxvi. 11, and Deuteronomy xxxii. 27. In Psalms lxxxix. 14, 43, and cxviii. 16, the word ימין, "right hand," is used in the same connection instead of simply יד, "hand"; and also in these instances is the force of the phrase clear and un-

¹ The phrase נישא ראש (see *e.g.*, Jer. lii. 31; Zech. ii. 4) is used in a similar sense,

doubted (note especially Psalm cxviii. 16 : ימין יהוה רוממה ; ימין יהוה עשה היל " the right hand of the Lord is exalted ; the right hand of the Lord doeth valiantly.") The realisation of superior personal power may bring with it a spirit of pride and of wilfulness. Hence we find the expression, ביד רמה, used in Numbers xv. 30 to signify presumptuous and wilful action as opposed to שגגה, which is sin committed " unwittingly." The idea of pride is indeed clearly contained in ידינו רמה of Deuteronomy xxxii. 27, to which reference has already been made, and a similar term is זרוע רמה, " a high arm," which stands parallel to רשעים in Job xxxviii. 15.¹

When, with these linguistic facts before us, we return to the lifting up of the hands of Moses during the battle of Rephidim, we cannot but connect the phrases which we have been considering with the particular event on which our attention is mainly fixed in the present paper. But there is this difference. In the instances from the Psalms and the other parts to which reference has been made the " lifting up of the hand " is used in a metaphorical sense, whilst in Exodus xvii. 11 the natural and primary meaning of the words employed is evidently to be taken. To some it might at first sight seem that this difference constitutes a difficulty in the way of the explanation offered here of Exodus xvii. 11. In reality, however, it only supplies a fresh interest from a linguistic point of view. It is a well-known principle in the science of language that metaphorical expressions are abstract development from original concrete notions. Thus, to take one instance out of the many in Biblical Hebrew alone, the phrase, חלה פנים originally

¹ The lifting up of the hand in making an oath (see *e.g.* Gen. xiv. 22) is, of course, an entirely different kind of phrase ; and רום יהו נשא in Habakkuk iii. 10 is apparently meant to signify consternation and surprise. Should, by the way, this phrase not be rendered " the high (parallel to תהום, " deep ") lifted up his hands," instead of " And lifted up his hands on high," adopted both in the A.V. and R.V. ?

meant "to stroke, or to smooth a person's face." From this notion comes the idea of caressing, soothing, and flattering; and when the phrase is finally used in the sense of "imploing a person's favour," the original concrete notion of "stroking the face" is, in practical speech, lost sight of altogether, and the only idea actually present is that of that "entreating and petitioning" for the favour desired. Instances might be multiplied to any extent, both from the Old Testament Hebrew and from any language under the sun; and we need, therefore, now only apply it to the term in which we are at present interested. The "lifting up of the hand," like the "lifting up of the horn" and the "lifting up of the head," acquired in the course of time the more or less purely metaphorical sense of "conscious valour and supremacy of power"; but originally it meant the actual raising aloft of the hand, or hands, as the natural expression of conquering physical strength. The subdued and conquered antagonist is bowed down and crushed, but the victor raises aloft the hand to strike the foe, or to threaten further punishment, if the opponent should not give in and submit himself to the conqueror's good pleasure. In all the other instances in which the term occurs the notion of conscious fortitude is so prevalent that the actual "lifting up of the hand" is hardly required to form a part of the idea conveyed; but in Exodus xvii. 11 we intercept, as it were, the phrase at an early stage of its linguistic development. Moses, as the representative and guiding spirit of Israel's hosts, actually raises aloft his hands as an effectual sign of strength and supremacy over the Amalekite foe. The phrase has already passed beyond its primary sense, for here it is not the actual combatants who lift up their hands, but a person who with intense interest watches the fight from the outside. But to the purely metaphorical notion in which the actual raising up of the hand is no more required it has not reached as yet. The concrete part of it

is indeed of such importance and reality in the present case that in order to ensure its unflagging continuance two other men are engaged in supporting the great leader, who, on behalf of a whole people, is raising aloft his hands in sure token of conquering strength.

It is clear, therefore, that the linguistic evidence makes entirely for the view of Exodus xvii. 11, which is here advocated, and if the undoubted failure of all the other proposed explanations be added to this and the other arguments brought forward in this paper, it will, I hope, be admitted that a sufficient case has been made out for the new theory formulated in this place, and I, at any rate, trust that my explanation may not be found unworthy of further investigation on the part of scholars.

G. MARGOLIOUTH.

THE THREEFOLD CORD.

ὁ φιλόσοφος καὶ ὁ μουσικὸς καὶ ὁ ἐρωτικὸς ἀνακτεῖσι (Plotinus, *Enn.*, 1. 3. 1.¹)

THE human mind, when in a healthy state, sets before itself three objects of desire—the good, the beautiful, and the true. The love of the good is religion; the imitation of the beautiful is art; the pursuit of the true is science or philosophy. These three objects are all *right*, that is to say, they are objects for the healthy mind; and they are all ends in themselves—they refuse to be followed as means to any end above them, or as means to each other. And yet, in spite of their independence—their claim to stand each in its own right, these three ideals are so closely interrelated,

¹ A sentence in the "letter of Plotinus to Flaccus," quoted by Prof. Max Müller (*Psychological Religion*, p. 433), would have supplied a better text. But I have not been able to discover the Greek original of this document, which appears to be a cento of Plotinian phrases thrown into the form of a letter to an imaginary correspondent by Vaughan (*Hours with the Mystics*, vol. i. p. 78).

that no sooner is one of them discarded in the supposed interest of another, than a swift Nemesis follows in the frustration of the end too exclusively sought. Thus, there is no more deep-seated faithlessness than that of the religious dogmatist who stops his ears and takes up stones when he hears the word "science" or "criticism" mentioned; his onesidedness is punished either by all manner of puerile superstitions, or by a harsh and narrow Puritanism, or, most often, by unconfessed, paralysing doubts. Similarly there is no philosophy of the universe so self-contradictory and so unscientific as that of the naturalist who will acknowledge nothing but mechanical forces, and who scoffs at every kind of idealism. And lastly, there is no art more ugly and repulsive than that which begins with a repudiation of morality, and ends with an attempt to improve upon nature's types of beauty. Mankind cannot dispense with any of these three great pursuits—religion, art, and science. And yet they often seem to hinder and conflict with one another, so that there is, and nearly always has been, considerable friction between the worshippers at these three shrines. It is hardly necessary to mention such time-worn controversies as those connected with free will, special intervention, and the reign of law, or with diverging æsthetic and moral standards in art, literature, and conduct. Those who have tried to reconcile and mediate between these antagonists have met with only very partial success. It seems quite certain that in dealing with the relations of the good, the true, and the beautiful, we occasionally encounter antinomies which the human reason cannot solve. If this be granted, it is plain that we are presented with three alternatives. Either we may choose one of the three ends and make it our own to the exclusion of the other two, a course which, as has just been affirmed, defeats its own aims; or we may adopt the pessimistic conclusion that the human mind is radically at variance with itself, so that no

synthesis is possible ; or, lastly, we may perform an act of faith, and accept a hypothesis which we cannot prove, namely, that the mind is not really divided against itself, and that ultimately the good, the true, and the beautiful, are one and the same,—that, in other words, they meet in God. This thought may remind us of the argument of Prof. Seeley in *Natural Religion*—that the naturalist and the artist “ worship God ” as well as the saint, and that their ideals also deserve the name of religions. There is truth in this, in so far as we are bound to admit that the pursuit of the true and of the beautiful as ultimate ends is right and proper ; but the use of religious terms in these connexions tends to obscure the fact that the object of religion—the good—is distinct from those of science and art ; and if “ religion ” is used to cover all these three pursuits, that which aims directly at the good will have no distinctive name. But though this widening of the scope of the word “ religion ” is on the whole more confusing than helpful, it has two advantages ; it implies that the nature of God (who as the Good is of course the object of religion) contains the true and the beautiful ; and also the choice of the word indicates the supremacy of the good over the other two objects of desire. The subordination of the beautiful to the good is expressed by Plotinus (who in this matter was the teacher of Augustine, as will be shown presently) by saying that though the good and the beautiful may be rightly identified in God, yet if we must distinguish, the good is the source and origin of the beautiful (*Enn.*, 1. 6, *ad fin.*) and the desire of it is “ older ” and prior to that of beauty (*Enn.*, 5. 5, 12).

Historically, there can be no doubt that the conception of the Divine Nature as uniting in itself the good, the true, and the beautiful, is a legacy of Greek philosophy, and especially of Plotinus, to the Church. The much derided “ vision ” of the great Neoplatonist is an attempt at a

final synthesis of admiration, *knowledge*, and love.¹ The second of these substantives has rather characteristically dropped out in the famous line of our great Platonic poet, and its place has been taken by *hope*, which may or may not be based on reason and experience. But fact and law claim recognition, which cannot be denied them with impunity. Whether the "philosopher," who, according to Plotinus, has the advantage of the artist and the lover in the upward path (since the last has to be weaned from the love of visible forms to that of the good) be a metaphysician or a naturalist, his intellectual life may elevate him to the knowledge of God, no less than art may raise the poet, or devotion the saint. The ascription of perfect beauty to God, and the belief in His self-revelation through beauty, have been too much forgotten in western theology, which has always been in danger of letting slip the Greek element in Christianity. Augustine, however, adopts *in toto* the teaching of Plotinus on this subject. Like Plotinus (and Shaftesbury in modern times) he speaks of three grades of beauty, corporal, spiritual, and divine (compare *Enn.*, 1. 6. 4, with *de Ord.*, 2. 16. 42 sq.). "Fair is the face of justice and righteousness," says the Pagan philosopher, "yea, fairer than the evening or the morning star"; and Augustine echoes him with "iustitia summa et vera pulchritudo est" (compare *Enn.*, 1. 6. 4, with *Enarr.* in Ps. 44. 3, and *Ep.* 120. 20, "quid est aliud iustitia vel quaelibet virtus, quam interioris hominis pulchritudo"). Augustine, like Plotinus, asserts repeatedly that God is the highest beauty—"Deus pulchritudo pulchritudinum omnium"; "omne pulchrum a summa pulchritudine est quod Deus est" (*Conf.* 3. 6. 10; *de Civ., qu.* 83, *qu.* 44). Both avoid the snare of

¹ This is well shown by his disciple Augustine, who accepts his doctrine of Vision, though not of Ecstasy. "Tendit bene vivendo etiam ad speciem pervenire, ubi est sanctis et perfectis cordibus ineffabilis pulchritudo, cuius plena visio summa est felicitas" (*Ench.*, 5).

deifying the beautiful, instead of ascribing beauty to the divine (see *Enn.*, 1. 6); and, so long as the supremacy of goodness is thus acknowledged, no objection can be taken to a line of thought which consecrates and purifies one of the strongest and noblest of our faculties.

If, then, we may follow Plotinus and Augustine in regarding art, science, and religion as three paths on the upward journey, converging towards a point still in the clouds, where they meet at the topmost peak of existence, we have our justification for an act of faith consisting in a frank recognition of the claims of religion, art, and science, and an equally frank avowal that there are points of conflict between them which cannot as yet be reconciled, though we absolutely refuse to admit that the contradictions are real and ultimate. On the debatable ground we must admit the fallibility of our judgment, though with a firm faith that our deepest convictions, whether in art, science, or religion, will not have to be sacrificed when the full vision is attained.

The rational idealism of the Alexandrians, whether Pagan or Christian, and of their Christian followers down to Scotus Erigena, is a side of religious thought which can never be neglected without danger. The attitude towards art and science, which I think is encouraged if not inculcated by their teaching, and which has been the subject of the present paper, is only one of the lessons which we may learn from them. There is, indeed, no more interesting epoch in the history of thought than the struggle between Christianity and Neoplatonism in North Africa, when a religion sprung from Judaism, and a philosophy sprung from Hellenism, competed against each other in an orientalised environment, which forced them both, as it were, to develop new organs, till they became very much alike. They quarrelled with the rancour which generally distinguishes two parties which like to express the same ideas in slightly different language, till the Church won the battle

—that is to say, it absorbed the rich gains of Alexandrian thought, converted its best opponents, and left the remainder to lose themselves in vain dreams and curious arts, forgetful of their master's warning—*τὸ δὲ ὑπὲρ νοῦν ἤδη ἐστὶν ἔξω νοῦ πεσεῖν*. In Augustine, at the best period of his life, we find an apparently stable reconciliation; but history proved that the two elements were ready to fall apart again. For the dominant type of Christianity, at least in the West, is one which tends to degenerate into crude anthropomorphism and excessive individualism; while Neoplatonism tends to degenerate into the opposite error of pantheistic mysticism. It is only on a high plane that the two can combine. But Christian Platonism can never be ousted from the Church while we have the Fourth Gospel, where the Logos doctrine, with all its far-reaching consequences, is brought into indissoluble connexion with the historical Christ. And so long as the Church identifies itself with a dogmatic system which was mainly built up during this period, a knowledge of the later Platonism, and some sympathy with it, will be indispensable to a true understanding of its formularies. A recent study of Plotinus has convinced me that the works of this philosopher, irritating as they are from their wretched style and chaotic arrangement, are of the very highest value to a student of Christian dogma. They throw much light on the growth of the doctrine of the Trinity (John Damascene even dares to say, too boldly of course (1. 7), that “we owe to Judaism the unity of the Divine Nature, but to Hellenism the distinction of persons”); on the idea of the Logos as in a sense the Ego of the universe (cf. Erigena “certius cognoscas Verbum Naturam omnium esse”); on the doctrines of union with Christ (cf. Plotinus' teaching on the relation of individual souls to the world-soul, which Augustine is far from rejecting), and of the membership and essential unity of all living spirits— notions which become

fantastic speculations or mere figures of speech to those who press the idea of personality as far in the direction of monadism as many do, but which really lie at the bottom of the whole Christian doctrine of redemption.

W. R. INGE.

CHRISTIAN PERFECTION.

II.

OTHER NEW TESTAMENT TEACHING.

WE have seen that the writers of the New Testament set before their readers, as a goal to be pursued, an ideal human excellence which they called *perfection*, or, as their language might be more correctly rendered, the *maturity* of moral and spiritual *manhood*. This ideal character, they described in different ways: and the variety of description suggested that they had not always in view precisely the same moral standard.

This perfection is, in the sermon on the mount, identified with a love to our enemies like the indiscriminating kindness of the God of nature. In the First Epistle of John the duty of love to our brethren is enforced by the example of the love manifested in the mission of the Son of God. We also read that such love banishes fear, and that he who fears is not perfected in love. This agreement of documents so different emphasises this aspect of Christian perfection.

The same ideal receives still further emphasis and unique honour in Matthew xxii. 37-40, Mark xii. 29-31, where our Lord teaches that to love God with all our hearts and to love our neighbour as ourselves are the two great commandments on which hang all the Law and the Prophets. The same two commands are enforced in Luke x. 27. In remarkable agreement with this teaching of

Christ found in all the Synoptist Gospels, we read in Romans xiii. 8-10 that he who loves his neighbour has fulfilled law and that every command is summed up in the one command, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." The same teaching receives further confirmation in the unique place [given to love in 1 Corinthians xiii. as the greatest of virtues. In these passages, no express mention is made of perfection or maturity. But they describe and enforce the ideal of perfection set before us by Christ in Matthew v. 48.

Another and very definite ideal, different from yet closely related to that just expounded, is given in 2 Corinthians v. 13-15, where St. Paul lays bare the aims and motives of his own ceaseless activity in the service of Christ. "If, (as may seem to some,) we have gone out of our minds, it is for God: if, (as others may say,) we are men of sober sense, it is for you. For the love of Christ holds us fast (*i.e.* leaves us no other course); since we have come to this judgment, that One died on behalf of all, therefore all died; and that He died on behalf of all in order that they who live may live no longer for themselves, but for Him who on their behalf died and rose."¹

Notice here a definite and very exalted ideal. Christ died in order to give to His followers an aim in life, the noblest conceivable aim, viz. the aim for which He laid down His life, and this aim embraced for His sake. Now, an aim persistently followed is needful in order to give to life unity and force: and the grandeur of life is conditioned by the aim pursued. Therefore, in order to ennoble even the humblest of His followers Christ gave Himself and His mission of mercy to be their one aim, that thus they might ever rise towards Him. This aim is practicable for all men

¹ The dative of advantage, which I have here suitably rendered, "for God . . . for you . . . for Him," is seriously obscured by the meaningless rendering of the Revisers, "unto God . . . unto you . . . unto Him."

at all times. For they who have least abilities can do something to help forward the work of Christ: and the most richly endowed find here an object worthy of their utmost effort and of any sacrifice it may involve.

The same ideal is set before us in Romans vi. 11; and in verse 10 Christ is presented as its pattern. "The death He died, He died to sin, once; the life He lives, He lives for God. In the same way also ye reckon yourselves to be on the one hand dead to sin, on the other hand living for God in Christ Jesus." We have here a negative counterpart to "living for God," viz. "dead to sin." This reminds us that all sin is hostility to God, and that consequently unreserved loyalty to God involves complete victory over all sin. And, since this victory comes through inward union with Him who died on the cross, the victors may be described as "dead to sin . . . in Christ."

This ideal finds its perfect human realisation in the incarnate Son. He says, in John iv. 34, "My food is that I may do the will of Him that sent Me and complete (*τελειώσω*) His work." So in John vi. 38, "I am come down from heaven, not in order that I may do My will, but the will of Him that sent Me." Similarly, in chapter v. 30, "I seek not My will, but the will of Him that sent Me." At the close of His course He said, as recorded in John xvii. 4, "I have glorified Thee on the earth, having completed (*τελειώσας*) the work which Thou gavest Me to do." We have here a definite aim set before the Son by the Father, ever kept in view, and accomplished.

The same ideal is in the New Testament embodied in other language. In John xvii. 17-19 our Lord prays, "Sanctify them in the truth: Thy word is truth." As Thou didst send Me into the world, also I have sent them into the world: and on their behalf I sanctify Myself, in order that also they may be sanctified in truth." So St. Paul prays in 1 Thessalonians v. 23, "May the God of peace

Himself sanctify you *all-perfect*: and your *entire* spirit and soul and body, may they be kept blamelessly at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ": ὁλοτελεεῖς καὶ ὁλόκληρον. He desires that God may sanctify his readers, and thus give them a *maturity* or *perfection* embracing every part of their being; and that every part may be kept in a manner leaving them open to no blame. In 1 Corinthians vii. 32, the aim of a Christian woman is said to be "how she may please the Lord": in verse 34 it is said to be, "in order that she may be holy in her body and her spirit." Evidently the two phrases describe the same ideal life.

In 2 Corinthians vii. 1, St. Paul exhorts his readers, "let us cleanse ourselves from every defilement of flesh and spirit, accomplishing holiness in the fear of God": ἐπιτελοῦντες ἁγιωσύνην. Here, as before, realised holiness is set before the readers as a goal to be pursued. Similarly, in Ephesians i. 4 we read that "He chose us in Him before the foundation of the world, that we should be *holy* and without blemish before Him." So chapter v. 25-27: "Christ loved the Church, and gave up Himself on her behalf; in order that He might *sanctify* her, having cleansed her with the laver of water, in the word, in order that He might, Himself to Himself, present the Church glorious, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing, but that she may be *holy* and without blemish." In Hebrews xii. 14 we are bidden to "follow after *sanctification*, without which none can see the Lord." A similar exhortation in very emphatic language is found in 1 Peter i. 15, 16: "But like as He that called you is *holy*, so be also yourselves *holy* in all manner of life, because it is written, *holy* shall ye be; because I am *holy*." In all the above passages, holiness is set before the readers as a goal for pursuit and attainment.

On the other hand, we notice that in the Epistles of St. Paul and the Book of Revelation frequently, and in the Book of Acts and the Epistle to the Hebrews, church-mem-

bers generally, without reference to their degree of maturity, are called "saints" or "holy persons." This is very conspicuous in 1 Corinthians i. 2: "to the Church of God, men sanctified in Christ Jesus, which is at Corinth, called saints." Yet in chapter iii. 1 the readers are described as "men of flesh, as babes in Christ," and therefore incapable of the spiritual food fit only (chap. ii. 6) for the "perfect," *i.e.* for men in Christ.

The real significance of the word *holy* as a description of the ideal life of the servants of Christ, and a solution of this apparent contradiction, are to be found in the holy objects of the old Covenant, *e.g.* the Sabbath, the tabernacle, the sacrifices, and the priesthood. For all these were devoted unreservedly to the service of God. They thus become symbols of the unreserved devotion which Christ claims from His servants. These last are a priesthood offering their own bodies as a living sacrifice, and thus keeping perpetual Sabbath. So 1 Peter ii. 5, "a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices"; and Romans xii. 1: "present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God, your rational service." In other words, the holiness set before the servants of Christ is unreserved devotion to Him and to His work.

On the other hand, that God had claimed for Himself and His service the various holy objects, placed these last, whatever men might do or fail to do, in a new and solemn relation to Himself. Men might desecrate the Sabbath, or the sanctuary, or the priesthood, but they were holy still, and their indelible sanctity condemned those who defiled them. In this very real sense all whom Christ saves He claims for His own. This is the OBJECTIVE holiness of the servants of Christ. In this most common sense of the word, they are spoken of as *saints* or *holy* persons. But occasionally we find holiness set before them as a goal to be pursued and attained. The word then denotes actual and

unreserved loyalty to Christ. This is the SUBJECTIVE holiness to which Christ calls His servants. Hence the apparently different use of the same word.

It is now evident that the subjective holiness set before us in various passages of the New Testament as a goal for our pursuit is identical with the unreserved devotion to Christ which, as we read in 2 Corinthians v. 15, He died to evoke ; and with the death to sin and life for God which, in Romans vi. 11, St. Paul bids his readers reckon to be theirs. Moreover, although this ideal life of devotion to God is not expressly spoken of in the New Testament as *perfection*, it may indisputably be fairly so described, in the sense in which the word τέλειος is there used. For they whose devotion is alloyed with selfishness and sin are but babes in Christ ; whereas they whose one purpose is to accomplish the purposes of God have attained a maturity of spiritual manhood. It is equally evident that this ideal, which found visible symbolic form in the holy objects of the ancient ritual, is practically equivalent to the whole-hearted love to God and man which, as Christ taught, summed up the whole requirement of the ancient law and which St. Paul taught to be a fulfilment of law and the highest Christian virtue. For loyalty without love is, if not a contradiction in terms, something far below the inward harmony essential to an ideal life. Taken together, these two elements describe fully the ideal life set before us in the New Testament. In proportion as we fall below, or approach this standard are we babes in Christ or full-grown men.

Other teaching of the New Testament not only gives to this ideal still greater definiteness, but places it in a very real sense within reach of all who put faith in Christ.

We are frequently taught that all spiritual growth is a work and gift of God. So, in Philippians i. 5, 6, in view of the spirit of brotherhood manifested by his readers, St.

Paul expresses a confident hope that He who has began a good work in them will complete it: *ἐπιτελέσει*, *i.e.* bring it to its goal. While urging them, in chapter ii. 12, to work out their own salvation, he remembers that it is God who works in them both to desire and to work on behalf of His good pleasure, *i.e.* to accomplish what seems good to Him. In Ephesians i. 19 St. Paul desires his readers to know the surpassing greatness of God's power in them that believe, which he compares to the power which raised Christ. The same is taught, in reference to the ideal life of holiness, in the prayer of Christ recorded in John xvii. 17, "Sanctify them in Thy truth"; and in St. Paul's prayer in 1 Thessalonians v. 23, "may the God of peace Himself sanctify you." For here sanctification is sought for as God's work. And this must be, inasmuch as the disciples and readers were already, as followers of Christ, objectively holy, the inward subjective holiness of actual devotion to God. Similar teaching underlies all the epistles of the New Testament.

This important doctrine, *viz.* that whatever God claims from us He is ready to work in us, is taught, at least as a hope for the good time coming, in the Old Testament. After the command in Deuteronomy vi. 5, "thou shalt love Jehovah thy God with all thy heart," we find a corresponding promise in chapter xxx. 6, "Jehovah thy God will circumcise thy heart to love Jehovah thy God with all thy heart and all thy soul." A similar prophetic promise is found in Ezekiel xxxvi. 25, "and I will sprinkle upon you clean water, and ye shall be clean: and from all your filthiness and from all your idols I will cleanse you." These great promises are re-echoed in earnest prayer in Psalm li. 7, "purge me with hyssop, and I shall be clean: wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow. . . . Create in me a clean heart, O God." All these passages imply that purification from sin and loyalty to God are a work of God in man.

We are frequently taught in the New Testament that the Holy Spirit of God given to His adopted sons is the inward source and animating principle of their new life of devotion to God. In Galatians v. 16, St. Paul bids his readers "walk by the Spirit, and ye will not accomplish the desire of the flesh"; and in verse 22 he gives a list of Christian virtues which he describes as "the fruit of the Spirit." So elsewhere frequently.

This teaching we can well understand. For the Holy Spirit is a bearer of all the attributes of God, and the inward and personal medium through whom God comes into immediate contact with the spirit of man. Moreover He is the Spirit of Christ. By His agency the heart of Christ beats in those whom the Son is not ashamed to call brethren. We wonder not that He imparts to men the mind and power of Christ and of God. Indisputably He is able to fill us with whole-hearted love to God and man and unreserved loyalty to the kingdom of God, like the love and loyalty of Christ. That God works in man, through the inward agency of His Spirit, whatever He claims from man, is one of the fundamental doctrines of the Gospel.

Yet, if this new life is to be in any real sense man's own life, it must be conditioned by his own free choice, by his free surrender to this divine guidance and acceptance of this divinely offered strength. And that the Spirit of God is received by faith and that His work in man is conditioned by faith, is frequently taught in the New Testament. In John vii. 38, after bidding the thirsty to come to Him and drink, Christ gives the wonderful promise that from those who believe in Him shall flow rivers of living water. This promise, the evangelist tells us in verse 39 refers to the Spirit whom they who believe in Him were about to receive. Here abundant spiritual usefulness, a sure mark of Christian maturity, is promised through the agency of the Spirit of God to all who believe in Christ. Similarly, in

Galatians ii. 20, St. Paul asserts that no longer does he live, but Christ lives in him. If so, St. Paul's life must be an outflow and counterpart of the life of Christ, and in some sense a prolongation of His life on earth, a life inspired by love to God and man and by unreserved devotion to the work of God. Here then we have in St. Paul's own blessed experience, the ideal life which he put before his readers. He goes on to say that, while Christ lives in Him, he lives "in faith." In other words, St. Paul's loyalty to God is conditioned by his faith in Christ. Similar teaching is found in Ephesians iii. 17, where St. Paul prays "that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith"; in 1 Peter i. 5, "who are guarded, in the power of God, through faith"; in 1 John v. 4, "this is the victory which hath overcome the world, even our faith"; and elsewhere frequently. That the new life breathed into man by the Spirit of God is conditioned by faith, is another primary doctrine of the Gospel of Christ.

This new life of loyalty to God involves complete deliverance from all sin. For all sin is hostility to God. And this deliverance from sin is an all-important element in the full salvation wrought by God in those who believe. It is expressly mentioned in the description given in Romans vi. 11: "dead to sin, but living for God, in Christ Jesus." So in 1 Corinthians vii. 1, the apostle bids his readers, "cleanse yourselves from all defilement of flesh and spirit, accomplishing holiness." Here and again in 1 John iii. 3, as conditioned by his own free surrender of faith, the cleansing is spoken of as man's own work: "he that hath this hope in him purifieth himself as He is pure." On the other hand, in chapter i. 7, 9 we read that "the blood of Jesus, His Son, cleanseth us from all sin. . . . He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." Here the cleansing is said to be the work of God and a result of the shed blood of Christ.

These and other similar passages are a virtual promise that God will here and now, by His own power, rescue from all bondage and defilement of sin all those who venture to believe His promise of such deliverance.

This deliverance involves victory over, and complete neutralisation of, all inward influences tending towards sin. But it does not necessarily involve their immediate annihilation or the annihilation of the source from which they spring. For, unless yielded to, these evil influences do not defile. For instance, the reformed drunkard who is painfully conscious of an appetite remaining in him, but who never yields to it, is a strictly sober man. God saves him from the accumulated power of a habit formed by sinful indulgence. But the habit can be destroyed only as it was formed, by continuous action. This subject will receive further attention in my next paper.

It is worthy of note that the aorist tense in 2 Corinthians vii. 1, 1 John i. 9 (*καθαρίσωμεν, καθάριση*) suggests a completed purification and not merely an approach towards it. And this is implied in the salvation from sin described in the foregoing paragraph. They who entrust their wayward hearts to Christ are already clean, but only because each moment the power of God saves them from defilement.

That the ideal life set before us in the New Testament is wrought by the Spirit of God in all who believe and when they believe, places this ideal in an aspect altogether new. Apart from this divine inworking, whole-hearted love to God and loyalty to the work of Christ would be only a distant goal to be pursued by our own moral effort. And for such sustained effort our own moral strength is altogether insufficient. But now all is changed. The question is no longer whether we are able to pursue and attain the goal set before us but whether God is able and ready to rescue us from all sin and to work in us here and now the devotion He claims; and whether we can trust Him from

this moment to do so. Thousands have made, and daily make, this venture of faith; and have found, by happy experience, an unseen hand breaking their old fetters and bearing them upwards and onwards with the strength of God. And this discovery has been to them a new era in their spiritual life.

Yet this discovery is to them not a goal attained but a new equipment for further and more rapid pursuit of a goal still before them. For all spiritual advance brings us into clearer light revealing a loftier ideal and the imperfection of even our best works. It is still our aim to be holy in body and spirit, and our prayer is that God may sanctify us and thus perfect in us that which each day's progress shows to be still lacking. So St. Paul, while asserting that he no longer lives but Christ lives in him, refuses to call himself perfected and ever presses forward to a loftier goal. In this he presents himself as a pattern for full-grown men in Christ.

Such then is the teaching of the New Testament, as I read it, about Christian Perfection. The word rendered *perfect* denotes the maturity of spiritual manhood; and this is set before us as an ideal to be realised in our own heart and life. Sometimes it is represented as complete control of the tongue; in other places as a result of brave endurance of hardship or temptation. Elsewhere it is goodwill to all, even to our enemies; and is incompatible with party spirit. Very conspicuous as supreme virtues are whole-hearted love to God and indiscriminating love to man, and unreserved devotion to Christ and to His work of saving men. Taken together, these last are an absolute standard by which each may measure his own spiritual stature. The writers of the New Testament, and especially St. Paul, teach that to this goal the power of God will raise us here and now, so far as we venture in faith to expect Him to raise us. But in this spiritual victory and elevation there

is no finality. For each upward step reveals heights still above us. But it reveals also a power still further raising us. To expect and to experience this inward revelation of the power of God in our own spiritual life, is to find rest amid toil and conflict, a rest which is ceaseless and effective activity and constant victory.

In view of this teaching of the New Testament, I shall in another paper discuss the teaching of Wesley on Christian Perfection; and certain subordinate questions connected with the same subject.

JOSEPH AGAR BEET.

PROF. HOMMEL ON ARPHAXAD.

THE archæological problems of the present are so numerous and exact such careful and methodical treatment that one is disposed to regret the appearance of works like that of Prof. Sayce and (one may add by anticipation) Prof. Hommel, in which some attempt is made to give critical archæological treatment of Old Testament problems. If these zealous archæologists had confined themselves to incidental suggestions, or at most to academical dissertations on well-defined minute portions of the Old Testament literature, one could receive with gratitude such modest contributions to historical study. But one grieves at the loss of time inevitably caused by the popularization of uncritical arguments and harmful misunderstandings. Prof. Hommel's book will no doubt contain much that is of interest. But if he wishes to prove the antiquity of the document known by the symbol P by arguments such as he has produced in his recent letter to the *Academy* (Oct., 1896) on Arphaxad, he will find few scholars to agree with him. The present writer has no expectation of being able to contribute more than this one point to the discussion,

and he will put what he has to say briefly. Genesis x. 22 (P) runs thus in the Revised Version: "The sons of Shem, Elam, and Asshur, and Arpachshad, and Lud, and Aram." Arpachshad (אַרְפַּכְשָׁד)—a more correct spelling than Arphaxad—has hitherto been variously explained. Some (beginning with Bochart) identify the name with that of the province of Arrapachitis, the mountainous region of the upper part of the river Zâb, still called Albâk by the Kurds. In recent times it has been proposed to combine the name Arrapachitis with that of the Assyrian province Arabâ or Arabha, repeatedly mentioned in the inscriptions (*e.g.* by Tiglath Pileser in the clay tablet inscription from Nimrûd, *Keilinschr. Bibliothek*, ii. 13), but this view seems no longer to be safe after the criticisms of Winckler. All that we can say is that it is extremely plausible to hold that the province of Arabha should be mentioned next after Assyria. Other critics, however, including no less a scholar than Schrader (*Cuneiform Inscriptions*, by Whitehouse, i. 97), reply that this cannot be (1) because the final syllable, *shad*, is unaccounted for; and (2) because Abraham, the "Hebrew," who derives his origin from Arpachshad (Gen. xi. 10, P), migrates, according to the same authority (Gen. xi. 31, P), from Ur-Casdim, which "is undoubtedly to be looked for in South Babylonia," far away from Arabha. (The inscriptions thus far give no support to the view that there were Chaldæans in Armenia; Kittel, *Hist.*, i. 181, note 9, admits that he has been rash.) Hence Schrader and his fellow-critics profess to explain Arpachshad as *arp-casd*, "boundary (or territory) of Chaldæa"; there is, in fact, an Arabic word, *wrafa*, meaning "boundary." It must be admitted that this is also very plausible. But just as the former school cannot account for *shad*, so the latter fails satisfactorily to account for *arp*; to look out for a word *arp* in the Arabic Lexicon is characteristic of the days when each critic "did that which was right in his own eyes," and is

hardly worthy of the age of Wright and Nöldeke. Now comes Prof. Hommel with a solution. He tells us that among the proper names in the document called P there are many which he and others can prove, by Assyriology and Egyptology, to be extremely ancient, and he regards the name Arpachshad as bearing the stamp of a time when there was close intercourse between Palestine and Egypt. Arpachshad is really *Ur-pa-Chesed*, i.e. Ur city of Chaldæa, and so we have conclusive evidence that the P document is not post-Exilic, but of a very early pre-Exilic origin. *Ur-pa-Chesed* is no doubt a hybrid word; *pa-*, as in *pa-kanana*, being Egyptian, and not Semitic. But this is just what proves the point. As the Egyptians at this early period borrowed from the Semites of Palestine (see Brugsch's *History of Egypt*), so the Semites doubtless borrowed from the Egyptians.

Now, if Prof. Hommel can show us that the names in P are to a larger extent primitive than we had thought, we shall be deeply obliged to him. But he must be cautious. His treatment of the names in the lists of the antediluvian patriarchs is to me, as an archæological critic, by no means satisfactory; he tries to prove far too much. And if his treatment of Arpachshad is a specimen of the chapters on proper names in his forthcoming book, he cannot expect much favour from critics. I have myself a liking for some of his earlier writings, but I shall be unable to spare time for a book which contains such learned trifling. I will now, to make amends, submit myself to his criticism and to that of the readers of the EXPOSITOR. Arpachshad appears to me to be a non-existent word; i.e. it is due to a scribe's error.

For ארפכשד read ארפך כשד, i.e. Arpach (and) Chesed. Shem had six, not five sons; Arpachshad is due to the combination of two names, one of which ended and the other began with the same letter. Both sides in the older

controversy are right. We can dispense neither with Arabḥa nor with Chaldæa. Arpachshad in v. 26 and in xi. 12 are, of course, the natural consequences of the initial error in x. 22. In both passages the correct reading is Chesed, *i.e.* Chaldæa. We are thus relieved from the necessity of appealing to Armenian for an explanation of *-shad*, to Arabic for the origin of *arp-*, and to Egyptian for that of *pa-*. It would be easy to start from the point we have now reached, and prove that, so far as x. 22 goes, the author of P must have written after the Exile (note the position of Elam at the head of the sons of Shem), but have been acquainted with geographical and other names of pre-Exilic origin. But time forbids me to enter upon this at present.

T. K. CHEYNE.

SURVEY OF LITERATURE ON THE NEW TESTAMENT.

INTRODUCTION.—Students of theology should cordially welcome a second edition of Principal Cave's *Introduction to Theology, its Principles, its Branches, its Results, and its Literature* (T. & T. Clark). The original edition of this *Introduction to Theology* was extremely valuable, especially for its lists of books in each department. To each work named a brief guiding criticism was added, by which any one could ascertain what book or books would best suit his purpose. These lists are in the present edition greatly enlarged and brought up to date. There are still strange omissions, neither Stephanus nor Sophocles being named among Greek Lexicons, neither Gloel nor Gunkel among works on the Holy Spirit. But Principal Cave does not profess to be exhaustive, and it will be very easy for the student to add his own favourites and to find his way, with the help of these lists, to the best literature on every subject connected with theology. Certainly Principal Cave's book is the best bibliographical guide the theological student possesses, and in other respects it is worth possessing.

A fourth volume of *Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica*, by members of the University of Oxford, has been issued by the delegates of the Clarendon Press. It contains five papers. The first of these is by Canon Hicks, on St. Paul and Hellenism. It is brief, but compresses into a few pages the results of much well-digested reading and fresh thought. Dr. Hicks' volume on the traces of Greek philosophy and Roman law in the New Testament does not cover the same ground. Next comes a paper on "The 'Galatia' of St. Paul and the 'Galatic territory' of Acts," by Prof. Ramsay, in which he produces some cogent reasons for the acceptance of his theory, and disposes of objections, especially those of Dr. Zöckler. By this paper he distinctly strengthens his position, and, besides, throws much light on one or two points of much importance for the understanding of the New Testament. Mr. F. C. Conybeare comes third with a Greek and a Latin version of the *Acta Pilati*. These are made by himself from two Armenian MSS., which confirm the readings of Tischendorf's A text. For the second version he chose Latin rather than Greek to lighten the labour. Mr. Conybeare is inclined to ascribe the *Acta* to an earlier date than most other scholars have thought justifiable. Fourth comes a remarkably stimulating paper by Mr. F. W. Bussell on the Purpose of the World-process and the Problem of Evil as explained in the Clementine and Lactantian writings in a system of subordinate Dualism. This is a paper of considerable importance for the history of philosophy and of theology. The last hundred pages of the volume are occupied by Mr. E. W. Watson's treatment of the style and language of St. Cyprian. Uncommon erudition is manifested in this essay, and the mine of philological information it contains is rendered available by a full index. Valuable as the previous volumes of this series have been, the present issue will probably be considered to contain more matter of general interest and of permanent importance.

In seventy pages Mr. J. C. du Buisson discusses *The Origin and Peculiar Characteristics of the Gospel of St. Mark and its Relation to the other Synoptists* (Clarendon Press). This introduction to the Gospel formed the Ellerton Essay for 1896, and is a clear, judicious, and well-informed statement of what has been ascertained regarding the second Gospel. In one respect it advances our knowledge by giving a clear account and criticism of the various secondary features in the Gospel. For his material in

this part of his treatise he expresses obligation to a lecture by Mr. Armitage Robinson. We do not know where one could find a more satisfactory introduction to the Gospel of St. Mark.

In the department of Introduction may be reckoned *Scripture and its Witnesses*, by Prof. J. S. Banks, of Headingly College. It forms one, and not the least noteworthy, of the excellent Wesleyan series of Books for Bible Students, and is published by Mr. Charles H. Kelly. Prof. Banks makes it his aim to answer the questions, Why do we believe in the genuineness of the Scriptures? and, Why do we believe in their Divine origin and authority? In answer to the former question he gives a survey of the testimony in favour of the canonical books, with references to the standard books in which a fuller exhibition of the evidence is given. In answer to the second question he adduces the testimony of Scripture to itself, of Christ's life, of history, of miracle, and of personal experience. A chapter on Inspiration is added; but Prof. Banks' treatment of this thorny subject leaves something to be desired. The little volume contains much useful knowledge, and will be found useful as a text-book for intelligent students of the Bible.

Some valuable hints on revelation and inspiration will be found in *The Bible its Own Witness* by Chagab (Elliot Stock). The style of the anonymous writer would stand improvement, but his ideas are well worth pondering.

From America we have received one or two volumes of more or less interest in this department. Dr. Franklin Johnson, of the University of Chicago, has published (with the London Baptist Tract and Book Society) a volume on *The Quotations of the New Testament from the Old, considered in the light of general literature*, and a very interesting volume it is. For Dr. Johnson's method is to justify the various uses which New Testament writers make of the Old, by analogous quotations and applications in ancient and modern literature. Of Dr. Johnson's erudition every page of the volume is evidence. There is no form of quotation, fragmentary or composite, in substance or by sound, rabbinic or allegorical, for which he does not produce abundant parallels from all literature. The book is therefore interesting, and it is useful as a repertory of analogies, but it can scarcely be called convincing. He has too little sympathy with those who have stated views opposite to his own, and frequently misses the point of their objections. Some-

times too he misses the point by which his own ultra-orthodox position can best be defended. Nevertheless the book is welcome, and, in many respects, helpful.

From Chicago also comes *The Use of the Infinitive in Biblical Greek*, by Clyde W. Votaw, Ph.D., Instructor in Biblical Greek in the University of Chicago. This is a complete, scholarly, and lucid treatment of the subject, and its results are rendered available for various purposes by being presented in several tabular forms. Some significant differences between the Greek of the LXX. and the New Testament are pointed out, and all students of Biblical Greek will be thankful to have so much information in so handy a form.

Prof. A. W. Anthony, of the Cobb Divinity School, has published (Silver, Burdett & Co., Boston) *An Introduction to the Life of Jesus*. The title is suggestive, and few books would be more welcome at the present time than one which should set us in a right attitude towards the life of Jesus, and enable us to see its significance, by presenting the actual conditions in which it was lived. But it is not this which Prof. Anthony attempts, but rather to state what is known of the sources, and to estimate their trustworthiness. The Gospels, the Epistles of Paul, the heathen references, the catacombs, the Jewish sources, are examined, and the results are presented in a popular style. The book would excellently serve the purposes of a class for senior scholars.

EXEGESIS.—To New Testament exegesis a notable contribution has been made in the *Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Luke*, by the Rev. Alfred Plummer, M.A., D.D., Master of University College, Durham. This forms the most recently-issued volume of the International Critical Commentary in course of publication by Messrs. T. & T. Clark, and realizes the ideal of what such a commentary should be. Dr. Plummer modestly disclaims the idea of its being final; but certainly it will for some considerable time to come hold its place as the best commentary in any language on the third Gospel. And when it is compared with already existing aids to the interpretation of St. Luke, its fulness and wealth reveal to us the comparative meagreness and poverty with which we have so long been content. No doubt we have had in recent years the spiritual Godet, the conscientious Alford, the grammatically exact Meyer, the voluminous and often suggestive Hahn; but Dr. Plummer

combines the several excellencies of his predecessors, and adds a breadth of treatment, an insight, and a knowledge peculiar to himself. His own idea is, that "if this commentary has any special features, they will perhaps be found in the illustrations taken from Jewish writings, in the abundance of references to the Septuagint, and to the Acts and other books of the New Testament, in the frequent quotations of renderings in the Latin versions, and in the attention which has been paid, both in the introduction and throughout the notes, to the marks of St. Luke's style." This last-mentioned feature is, happily, prominent, and so are the others. But those who use the commentary will be quite as much struck by the advance made in the ascertainment of the text, and the meaning of the words used, and especially by that sound sense, amounting almost to genius, which distinguishes all Dr. Plummer's contributions to New Testament literature. There may be points omitted in this commentary which are touched upon in others, but there will be universal consent that this is the best we have, and that alone and in itself it is a sufficient equipment for the full understanding of the Gospel of St. Luke.

In Messrs. Rivington, Percival & Co.'s Books of the Bible, *The Gospel according to St. Matthew* has been edited by the Rev. A. E. Hillard, M.A. This series is intended to provide boys with concise notes, such as have been found from experience to be most useful to them. Much useful matter is compressed into a brief introduction, although Papias is slightly misquoted.

NEW TESTAMENT THEOLOGY.—It might seem more accurate to mention Mr. Charles' *Apocalypse of Baruch* (A. & C. Black) under the head of Introduction, but there is much in the volume which has a direct bearing on New Testament theology. Being written, as Mr. Charles shows, part by part during the second half of the first century, it is contemporaneous with the apostolic literature, and, proceeding from Jewish circles, it gives us the actual background necessary for the understanding of that literature. To have this precious Apocalypse in so convenient a form, and so admirably equipped with all explanations and references which can make it serviceable to the student of the New Testament, is indeed a great boon. The critical introduction is a masterpiece; and as, step by step, Mr. Charles reaches his conclusions, a feeling of confidence in his guidance is engendered. The notes are uniformly to the point, and in matters connected with the

theology of the Pharisees are eminently instructive. The Apocalypse proper is translated by Mr. Charles from the Syriac MS. of the sixth century, now in the Ambrosian Library at Milan, while the Epistle of Baruch is translated from a new and critical text based on ten MSS. This text is printed alongside of the translation.

Another volume which will prove a welcome addition to the apparatus of the student of New Testament theology is Canon Mason's "Bishop Paddock Lectures" on *The Conditions of our Lord's Life on Earth* (Longmans, Green & Co.). In these lectures Dr. Mason sets himself to the task of collecting, and arranging, and explaining the allusions in the Gospels and Epistles which throw light upon the relation of the Divine and human natures in our Lord's person. "In order to see, as far as it may be given us to see, how the two natures met in the actual experience of our Lord, we shall do well not to insist upon preconceived notions of how they must have met, but rather to look carefully at what He said about Himself, and what others remarked in Him." Presenting in separate chapters what is said of our Lord's development in moral character, of His power, and of His knowledge, he furnishes us with the requisite material for framing a theory; and by the illuminating remarks which he makes upon the passages cited, he greatly aids his reader in forming an accurate apprehension of the facts on which all theories of our Lord's person must be based. The only blot on the book, besides a misprint in the Greek (p. 21), is the following: "Clever and ingenious persons, approaching the Bible from outside, so to speak, as if it were a newly discovered book about which there is nothing known, and selecting portions from it after an arbitrary fashion, can make systems out of it that are entirely unlike that which has been received in the Church. This was the way in which, with regard to Church polity, Calvin and the Presbyterians went to work in the sixteenth century." In what sense did Calvin "approach the Bible from outside"? Trained within the Church, and saturated with patristic literature and with the theology of the schoolmen, it is hard to see how any man, even Canon Mason himself, could be more "inside." If by chance Dr. Mason has, in his studies, overlooked Blondel's *Apologia pro sententia Hieronymi de Episcopis et Presbyteris*, its perusal might throw some light on Calvin's attitude. But Canon Mason has given us a thoroughly useful book, and slight blemishes may well be forgiven.

A third edition of Sabatier's *L'Apôtre Paul* has been issued (Librairie Fischbacher). The chief alterations are in the note on the Man of Sin, in the account given of the state of the Church at Corinth, and now and then a modification of what had originally been said. An Appendix is added on the origin of sin as stated in the theology of Paul. A map of Paul's journeys is also added, and by the use of different colours for the different routes they are easily followed. Sabatier's work still holds the foremost place in Pauline literature.

Religious Faith, by the Rev. Henry Hughes, M.A. (Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co.), is an attempt at a philosophical vindication of New Testament theology. Whether this be considered to have failed or to have succeeded, Mr. Hughes has made a careful analysis of the meanings of "faith" in the New Testament, which will assist even those inquirers who may not agree with his conclusions.

SERMONS.—Among sermons the first place must be given to the Anglican Pulpit Library, published by Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton. The volume recently issued covers that part of the year which extends from Whitsunday to the Ninth Sunday after Trinity. This volume, like the others which have already appeared in the same series, contains, not only sermons by the best preachers, but also outlines and illustrations. The form of the book is all that can be desired, and its contents are exceptionally good.—The Rev. J. G. Greenbough, M.A., has published a volume of sermons preached by him during the year of his occupancy of the Presidential Chair of the Baptist Union. It is entitled *The Cross in Modern Life*, and is issued by Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton. The sermons are well worth printing, containing, as they do, a large amount of original thought presented in a singularly graceful and pleasing style.—*From the Garden to the Cross, a Study of our Lord's Passion*, is the title of a volume of discourses by A. B. Cameron, M.A., D.D. (Isbister & Co., Ltd.). These discourses cover ground which has frequently been traversed before, but Dr. Cameron, by independent enquiry and by his command of a perspicuous narrative style, has proved himself able to engage the interest of his readers afresh and to bring some additional light into the closing scenes of our Lord's life.—It is rather late either to criticise or to chronicle the appearance of Dr. Watson's *Mind of the Master* (Hodder and Stoughton), which al-

ready has forced its own way into all English-speaking countries. The book is brilliant and revolutionary, and necessarily has the defects of its qualities. As a protest, it is forcible; as a final judgment on the questions involved, it is inadequate and even misleading. It pleases the lay theologian, but exasperates the professional. And its significance largely consists in its easy disregard of eighteen centuries of Christian thinking. "Back to Christ," is an excellent cry, but Christendom may be forgiven if it questions whether any one can lead us back to Christ so effectively as St. Paul did.—A volume to be strongly recommended both to clergy and laity, is *The Gospel for an Age of Doubt*, by Henry Van Dyke, D.D. (Macmillan & Co., Ltd.). The discourses in this volume were delivered as the Yale Lectures on Preaching. They are characterised by a wide and accurate knowledge of modern literature, together with a clear knowledge of the genius of Christianity and a firm, enthusiastic hold of the essentials of our faith. The chapters on the "Unveiling of the Father" and "the Human Life of God," are full of theological thought, and are eminently suggestive.—Also well worthy of attention, especially by young men, are the *Christ Church Sermons* of the Rev. E. F. Sampson, M.A., formerly Censor of Christ Church, Oxford (Longmans, Green & Co.). They are admirably adapted to their audience, both in respect of the subjects handled and the style of treatment. They are grave, serious, thoughtful, and always in touch with reality. The "Introductory Essay" gives some insight into the influences which moved and moulded the past generation of Oxford men.—Mr. S. A. Tipple, of Norwood, issues another volume of sermons under the title, *The Admiring Guest, and other Sermons* (Elliot Stock). They are lively and stimulating, with a certain body of original thought.—To Dr. Robertson Nicoll's series of Little Books on Religion (Hodder and Stoughton), Dr. J. Monro Gibson has added an instructive lecture on *The Unity and Symmetry of the Bible*; and Dr. James Denney, seven discussions of some *Gospel Questions and Answers*; and in these discourses the Author is at his best. His exegetical insight and firm grasp of the principles and bearings of the spiritual life lend exceptional value to the little volume. It is one of the best productions of his pen.—*God's Garden, Sunday Talks with Boys*, by Rev. W. J. Foxell, M.A., B.Mus. (Lond.), Minor Canon of Canterbury (Macmillan & Co., Ltd.), is introduced to public

favour by Dean Farrar. The suitability and excellence of the "Talks" are further guaranteed by the fact that most of them have already appeared in the *Sunday Magazine*. They are carefully written, and are free from all slovenliness either of thought or language. They are also very simple and direct, sufficiently and effectively illustrated, not with hackneyed stories, but from the preacher's own reading or experience. They deserve to win a high place in the branch of literature which concerns itself with the moral and religious life of boys.—To the same class of books, although different in method, belongs Dr. George V. Reichel's *What shall I Tell the Children?* (H. R. Allenson). Dr. Reichel has in view very young children, and his book consists of a large number of object lessons which are well fitted to suggest subjects and methods of treatment to teachers and preachers.

MISCELLANEOUS.—Of miscellaneous books which have recently appeared, some are of special interest to the student of the New Testament. Among these may be mentioned *The Life and Letters of Fenton John Anthony Hort, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D.*, by his son, Arthur Fenton Hort (Macmillan & Co., London). It is only just to publish the life of a scholar at once so well known and so little known as Dr. Hort. Necessarily his writings convey little impression of his character, except in so far as they suggest a fastidious conscientiousness and readiness to postpone everything to the ascertainment of truth. But all who appreciate his work wish to know more, and the two fascinating volumes edited by his son give us the information we seek. They reveal to us a man the very antipodes of a dry-as-dust pedant, a man with many interests and enthusiasms, a lover of the arts and of nature, an athlete and one of the founders of the Alpine Club, a man of restless mind but always at leisure for the demands of friendship, and finding his truest joy in his own home and family. Indeed, one sees that Dr. Hort would have accomplished more, although he would not have been so attractive a man, had he been more limited in his interests. The volumes are also valuable as giving us the inner history of his great work in connection with the text of the New Testament.

The Preaching of Islam, a History of the Propagation of the Muslim Faith, by T. W. Arnold, B.A., Professor of Philosophy, Aligarh (Archibald Constable & Co.), is a volume which presents

the results of considerable research. As a history of the propagation of Islam *by preaching* it is welcome. It reveals a side of Islam which is too often overlooked, and it relates the history of its peaceful conquests in a most interesting manner; but it can scarcely be termed with justice "a history of the propagation of the Muslim Faith," for undoubtedly other methods than those of peace have been used, and alongside of the passages quoted from the Quran should have been placed passages of a very different character. The author, indeed, warns his readers that it is but one aspect of Islam that he presents, but unwary persons may be misled.

Thirteen years ago, in celebration of the fourth centenary of Luther's birth, Dr. Wace and Dr. Buchheim published a translation of some of his principal writings under the title, "First Principles of the Reformation." These translations have been carefully revised, and with his larger and shorter Catechisms are now re-issued, in a volume entitled *Luther's Primary Works*, edited by Henry Wace, D.D., and C. A. Buchheim, Ph. D. (Hodder and Stoughton). The three primary works which are here republished are the Address to the Nobility, Concerning Christian Liberty, and the Babylonish Captivity of the Church. The Greater Catechism, which gives a more complete view of Luther's teaching than any other of his writings, has never before been translated. The Essays on the principles and political history of the Reformation are now relegated to an Appendix. The translating and editing have been done with the greatest care, and the volume gives to the English-speaking world the opportunity of knowing Luther at first hand, and of studying the Reformation in its most important sources.

The Land of the Monuments: Notes of Egyptian Travel, by Joseph Pollard, Member of the Council of the Society of Biblical Archæology. With Introduction by the Rev. W. Wright, D.D. With Map and 15 Illustrations (Hodder and Stoughton). The author of this volume is an expert in Egyptology, and himself visited the country after years of familiar acquaintance with the literature of the subject. He knew what to look for and how to use all he saw. The volume now given to the public is very different from the shallow notes and ignorant impressions of the Nile tripper. Mr. Pollard knows precisely what information the public desires, and how it should be given, and his volume hap-

pily combines the scientific perception of the trained savant with the personal observation of the traveller interested in what he sees and capable of interesting others. Whether one approaches Egypt from the point of view of the casual visitor, or of the Biblical student, or of the Egyptologist, no better introduction to it exists than that which Mr. Pollard here furnishes. It is a book of rare excellence, the product of lifelong and loving labour.

Evil and Evolution, by the author of "The Social Horizon" (Macmillan & Co., Ltd.), is an attempt "to turn the light of modern science on to the ancient mystery of evil." Like many other attempts to solve the problem of evil, it is excellent critically and destructively, but unsatisfactory as a positive, constructive theory. The statement of the problem shows a complete comprehension of it, and the criticism of the various solutions which have been proposed is acute and valid. The author's own theory is that the maladjustments in creation and the consequent suffering and various evil, are due, not to the inability, nor to the indifference, least of all to the deliberate intention of the Creator, but to the presence and power of an enemy,—in short, of Satan. The bearings of evolution on the problem seem to be somewhat misapprehended, but the volume is well worth reading.

The Rev. W. Yorke Fansset, M.A., publishes a convenient edition of Augustine's treatise, *De Catechizandis Rudibus* (Methuen & Co.), which forms an excellent introduction to the study of the Latin Fathers. The notes are judicious and interesting.

The second part of Dr. Stokoe's excellent *Old Testament History for Schools* has been issued by the Clarendon Press; and an addition to the "Guild Text Books," published by Messrs. A. & C. Black, has been made by the Rev. J. N. Ogilvie, of Bangalore, who has contributed a well-written account of *The Presbyterian Churches, their Place and Power in Modern Christendom*.

We have received Archdeacon Sinclair's Fifth Charge on *Points at Issue between the Church of England and the Church of Rome* (Elliot Stock), which, in common with all writings from the same hand, is full of information and loyal Protestantism.—From Melbourne (Melville, Mullen & Slade) comes a third edition of Prof. Rentoul's *The Early Church and the Roman Claim*, in which the Protestant position is cleverly defended against Archbishop Carr's extravagant assertions. Prof. Rentoul discusses with adequate

knowledge the primacy of Peter, the rise of a sacerdotal order, and the evolution of the Papacy.—From Mr. Elliot Stock we have still another Anglo-Israelite brochure, *Ephraim*, by Col. E. F. Angelo; also a plea for universal restitution, by S. W. Koelle, Ph.D., entitled *The Apocatastasis; the Life and Sayings of the late Kilsby Jones*, by Vyrnwy Morgan; *Short Prayers and Responses*, for use in Free Churches; and a much-needed book, which should receive attention, *The Condition of Working Women and the Factory Acts*, by Jessie Boucherett, Helen Blackburn, and others; also *Gems of Illustration*, compiled by the Rev. George Coates.—Messrs. James Nisbet & Co. issue for the Rev. Andrew Murray another series of his addresses entitled, *Out of His Fulness*.—Messrs. William Blackwood & Sons publish *The Supremacy and Sufficiency of Jesus Christ as set forth in the Epistle to the Hebrews*, by Ignotus. The chapters in this book were prepared as lessons for a Bible class.—*The Christian's Looking-Glass, a Mirror of Christ's Doctrines*, by Henry Smith, is issued by Messrs. Watts & Co.—*The Life that is Easy*, by C. Silvester Horne, of Kensington Chapel, is published by Mr. H. R. Allenson; and discourses on the aspect of the Christian Life indicated in the title.—*Alpha and Omega*, is the name given to a small volume of vigorous and suggestive addresses by Rev. William Middleton, published by Mr. Charles H. Kelly, and well worth reading. Mr. James Bowden publishes for Mr. Coulson Kernahan, *The Child, the Wise Man, and the Devil*, an impressive apologetic for Christianity.—*The Great Foundation* is also a brief apologetic treatise translated from the Dutch of J. H. L. Roozemeijer, and published by Messrs. James Nisbet & Co.—*A Concise Manual of Baptism*, by J. Hunt Cooke, expounds the ordinance from the Baptist point of view, apparently with no perception of the difficulties of his position. It is issued by the Baptist Tract and Book Society, from whom we also receive *The Clue to the Ages*, by Ernest Judson Page.

From America we have received some books of considerable interest. The 3rd and 8th volumes of the series entitled, "Ten Epochs of Church History," are published by the Christian Literature Company. The third volume is *The Ecumenical Councils*, by William P. Du Bose, S.T.D. The author is already favourably known on this side of the Atlantic by his "Soteriology," which is one of the freshest theological discussions that has appeared in recent times. It was manifest in that volume that Dr.

Du Bose had made an independent and eager study of Christology. In pursuance of this bent he now relates the history of the growth of the Church's convictions regarding the Person of Christ: and this history is given with profound insight and intense enthusiasm. A book more likely to interest the indifferent, and to instruct those already interested, it would be difficult to imagine. The 8th volume of the series is written by Dr. Clinton Locke, on *The Age of the Great Western Schism*, and fulfils the aim of the prospectus to produce "popular monographs, giving a bird's-eye view of the most important events in the life of the Church."

The Power of Silence, by Horatio W. Dresser (Ellis, Boston), has attained a fourth edition, and is now accompanied by another volume from the same hand, entitled *The Perfect Whole*. They may be described as an attempt at a philosophy of life based on the idea of the immanence of God. Decided aptitude for philosophizing is revealed, and ideas of importance are uttered, if sometimes these are not put in their most effective form. Both books are worthy of attention.

A new edition of Dr. Weidner's adaptation of Oehler's *Biblical Theology of the Old Testament* has been issued by the Fleming H. Revell Company, New York.

The second volume of the Dogmatic which forms a part of Prof. Bovon's great work has been issued by Georges Bridel & Cie., Lausanne. It handles the subjects usually treated in the second half of systems of theology, the doctrines of grace and the last things. It has the advantage of being excellently written, and also of being thoroughly up to date.

Attention may also be directed to the text-book on *Symbolik*, by Prof. Karl Müller, of Erlangen (Georg Böhme). It is divided into five parts, which treat respectively of the primitive Catholicism, the Roman, the Greek, the Lutheran, and the Reformed creeds. The arrangement throughout is convenient, and as we have no English book covering the same ground, the advisability of translating Prof. Müller's book might be considered.

MARCUS DODS.

ISRAEL IN EGYPT AND THE EXODUS.

WITH REFERENCE TO PROF. FLINDERS PETRIE'S RECENT
DISCOVERY.

THE recent discovery by Prof. Flinders Petrie of the mention of "the people of Israel" on a monument of Merenptah, the son of Rameses II.,¹ will afford food for reflection to Egyptological experts for a considerable time to come; but meanwhile we may be permitted to submit some views, based on earlier studies, on which this discovery seems to have a very direct bearing. We assume for the present that the reading of the passage given by Prof. Petrie, on the authority of Mr. Griffiths—"The people of Ysiraal is spoiled; it hath no seed"—is correct; that at least the proper name can with certainty be identified with "Israel," though neither point is beyond challenge.² It may turn out that, as in the cases of the supposed mention of "the King of Judah" in the lists of Shishak at Karnak, or of "Ahab of Israel" on the monolith of Shalmaneser II., this reading may have to be abandoned, but there is a

¹ *Contemporary Review*, May, 1896.

² Dr. Spiegelberg, of Strassburg, in whose hands the results of Prof. Petrie's excavations have been placed, and who has published the text of the inscription (in *Reports of the Royal Academy at Berlin*), gives a different translation—"Israel is a barren land without fear"—and finds a difficulty in the rendering of the Hebrew *Sin* by *S*. Prof. W. Max Müller, an able American Egyptologist, author of the book *Asien und Europa*, renders, "Israel has been torn out without offshoot," but is clear about the proper name (in *New York Independent*, July 9th). Sir P. le Page Renouf has challenged the reading altogether, and maintains that it is "Jezeel" that Prof. Flinders Petrie has mistaken for "Israel." Prof. Cheyne and Colonel Conder support Prof. Petrie. Dr. Steindorff, in *Zeitschrift f. alttest. Wissenschaft*, translates "Israelites," not "Israel" (1896, 2nd Part, p. 331).

sufficient consensus of opinion in its favour to warrant at least its provisional acceptance. Then we are brought face to face at once with an exceedingly interesting problem. It is well known that, according to the generally received view of the connection of the history of Egypt with that of Israel, Rameses II., the father of Merenptah, was the Pharaoh of the great oppression, and Merenptah himself—or, if not he, one of his immediate successors—was the Pharaoh of the Exodus. There are many plausible reasons for this identification, particularly the mention of “the store-cities, Pithom and Raamses” in Exodus i. 11, and it is not surprising that it should have gained the almost unanimous assent of scholars, and have come to be regarded by them as beyond serious dispute. Yet the newly-discovered inscription would seem to deal a death-blow to this theory, for the “spoiling of Israel” to which it relates took place, not in Egypt, *but in Palestine*—was, in fact, part of a general subjugation of the northern nations by Merenptah. Obviously, if the Israelites were already settled in Palestine in the reign of this monarch, he could not be the Pharaoh of the Exodus. Prof. Flinders Petrie, in his article, makes various suggestions to obviate this difficulty, but they are of a somewhat far-fetched character (as, *e.g.*, that part of the children of Israel had either never left Canaan, or had returned to it before the Exodus), and we do not observe that they have met with much favour.¹ A hypothesis which has commended itself to several²—it would appear independently—is that which makes the words “is spoiled, hath no seed” refer retrospectively to the repressive measures of Pharaoh recorded in Exodus i. But, apart from the grave doubt as to the reading, this also

¹ These alternatives of Prof. Petrie, which find a point of support in 1 Chron. vii. 21, 22, are ably discussed and rejected in an article in the *Neue Kirchzeitung*, No. 6, by Dr. Sellin. The writer favours the view of the destruction of the male children by Pharaoh.

² Dr. Sellin, as above; and writers in *Expository Times* for July.

must be regarded as unsatisfactory. It is too plainly a harmonistic makeshift, and it is overlooked, besides, that the edicts in question, commanding the destruction of the male children,¹ were over eighty years old at the time of the Exodus, and had early become practically a dead letter. Else how could there have been a vast body of people to go out of Egypt at all, or a younger generation swelling to hundreds of thousands, as the numberings show to have existed?² We are driven, therefore, as the remaining alternative, to face the question of the correctness of our original assumption, and boldly to ask whether, after all, the Exodus took place, as commonly supposed, under Merenptah, or whether, as many older Egyptologists held, and a minority have always contended, some couple of hundred years earlier, under the 18th dynasty. This is the view to which, on independent grounds, we have always felt constrained to adhere, and the new discovery gives it added probability.³ The time is perhaps opportune for a brief statement of the reasons which shut us up—we were about to say almost demonstratively—to the earlier date.

We shall endeavour to show below that the Exodus is placed by Manetho, and nearly all ancient historians and chronologers, under the *eighteenth*, and not under the nineteenth dynasty, as is often stated; but we may first consider a little more critically the bearings of the newly-discovered inscription on the question. We shall then look back to the 18th dynasty, and ask the reader's attention to the remarkable harmonies of date and circumstance which, without being sought for, meet us there.

In two ways the inscription brought to light by Prof. Flinders Petrie seems absolutely to exclude the hypothesis

¹ Exod. i. 16, 22.

² Num. i.-iii.

³ The probable need of a change of view has already been acknowledged by several scholars since the discovery, as Prof. W. Max Müller and Dr. Steindorff.

that the Exodus took place under the 19th dynasty, in the reign of Merenptah, or of his son, Seti-Merenptah, as some think, a few decades later.¹

1. The Israelites are already settled in Palestine in the reign of Merenptah—the apparently insuperable difficulty referred to above. A singular confirmation of this result is derived from another inscription of the reign of Merenptah, not hitherto much noticed. Speaking of the district of Goshen, this inscription says:—"The country around was not cultivated, but left as a pasture for cattle, because of the strangers. It was abandoned since the time of the ancestors." This clearly proves, as Dr. Naville has remarked, "that the land of Kes, or Kesem (Goshen) was not inhabited,"² and the abandonment had been of long duration. The Israelites, therefore, it is natural to conclude, had left it before the days of Merenptah.

2. The chronology imperatively forbids such a synchronism. This, to our mind, is a point of even greater importance than the other, for it does not depend, like that, on minute accuracy of translation; yet, if Prof. Petrie is correct in placing the middle of Merenptah's reign about 1200 B.C., it seems quite decisive of the fact that the Exodus could not have happened *then*, but must have occurred much earlier. This is a matter, therefore, entitled to receive our closest attention.

The uncertainty of Egyptian chronology is proverbial, but most writers have followed Lepsius in placing the accession of Merenptah about 1322 B.C. (Brugsch, 1300; Lenormant, 1350), and the Exodus a few years later.³ The

¹ The balance is thought by some to be turned in favour of the latter king by a hieratic inscription deciphered by Dr. Eisenlohr, of Heidelberg, in 1872 (*Trans. S. B. A.*, i. pp. 355-384). Sir J. W. Dawson also argues for this view.

² Paper on "The Route of the Exodus," in *Transactions of the Victoria Institute*, vol. xxvi. (1892-3). Dr. Naville and Prof. Sayce infer from this, *per contra*, the presence of the Israelites in Goshen as a pastoral people. But surely the language does not apply to a thickly populated district.

³ It is important to notice how Lepsius arrived at this result. The

tendency in recent years, however, has been to lower considerably the dates of Rameses II. and Merenptah,—Lieblein (whose method of genealogies Brugsch adopts, though differing from him in results) bringing Rameses down as late as the 12th century (1170),¹ while others place the accession of Merenptah about 1280 or 1250. Prof. Petrie goes below these latter dates, and, on the ground of astronomical data, places the accession of Merenptah in 1208 B.C., and the Exodus about 1200 B.C.² We are perfectly aware of the great insecurity of these astronomical reckonings, and that the most diverse schemes of Egyptian chronology are supported by appeal to them.³ There seems, however, to be a remarkable concurrence of evidence fixing the dates of Thothmes III. in the 18th dynasty, as Dr. Mahler does,⁴ at about 1503 to 1449 B.C., and from this, with the aid of other data, Prof. Flinders Petrie reckons down to the date of Merenptah before given, with the assurance that he can hardly be more than a few years wrong at the utmost.⁵ Assuming, however, as again we

Alexandrian astronomer Theon gave the year 1322 B.C. as the commencement of a cycle named by him "the era of Menophres." Lepsius supposed *μενόφρεως* to be an error for *μενόφθεως*, and identified accordingly. But there seems the highest probability that Lepsius was wrong, and that Menophres is to be identified with Rameses I., the first king of the 19th dynasty, whose throne-name was Men-peh-ra (Flinders Petrie, *Hist. of Egypt*, ii. pp. 29, 33; compare art. "Manetho," in Kitto's *Bib. Cyclop.*). This date, therefore, brought to prove the accession of Merenptah in 1322 B.C., rather proves the opposite, and shows that his date must fall late in the next century.

¹ *Revue Archéologique*, October, 1868.

² *Hist. of Egypt*, i. pp. 250-1.

³ See remarks by Brugsch, *Hist. of Egypt*, i. pp. 35, 36; art. "Manetho," as above; Canon Cook, Essay appended to *Speaker's Commentary* on Exodus, pp. 454-5. Brugsch himself, founding on the same data as Mahler, places the accession of Thothmes III. about 1600 B.C. (*Hist.*, i. p. 395), and is followed by Conder, in *The Bible and the East* (p. 51). Lenormant can, "with mathematical and absolute certainty," fix the accession of Rameses III. (half a century after Merenptah) in 1311 B.C. (*Ancient Hist.*, i. p. 269), etc.

⁴ Dr. Mahler's calculations are set forth in the *Zeitschrift für Aegyptische Sprache* for Sept. 1, 1889. His dates are accepted by Sayce, Tomkins, Brugsch-Pasha, Petrie, etc.

⁵ See his tables, *Hist. of Egypt*, ii. pp. 28-34, and Canon Cook's Essay cited

may provisionally do, that this date for Merenptah is approximately correct, the difficulty it creates for the current theory is sufficiently obvious. Even on the higher reckoning of 1322 B.C. for the accession of Merenptah, it was difficult enough to find space for the events recorded in the Book of Judges, arrange them in "strands" as one may, but if a century more is to be taken off from the interval between the Exodus and the building of the Temple, we venture to say, despite Prof. Petrie's opinion to the contrary, that the problem is insoluble. The date of the founding of the Temple may now be approximately fixed by the aid of the Assyrian synchronisms with the Books of Kings at 969 B.C.,¹ leaving roughly 230 years as the length of the interval between this event and the assumed date of the Exodus (1200 B.C.). Deducting from this, on the one side, the period of the desert wanderings and of the conquest under Joshua, and, on the other, the interval and reigns from Eli to the building of the Temple, it will be seen to leave scarcely sixty or seventy years for the whole period of the Judges, *i.e.*, from Joshua to the death of Eli—a reckoning impossible to harmonise with any reasonable version of the facts.² To lower the chronology, therefore, as Prof.

above. A striking corroboration of the later date for Merenptah may be here mentioned, though in itself much weight cannot be laid upon it. In Mr. Gladstone's *Time and Place of Homer*, allusion is made to the invasion of Egypt by the Achæans mentioned on the monuments as taking place in the fifth year of Merenptah. On various grounds, but specially on the ground that the name Achæans immediately thereafter disappears from the monuments, Mr. Gladstone plausibly concludes that this expedition happened a few years before the fall of Troy (pp. 144, 187). If any faith can be placed in the old statement of Trogus, preserved in Justin (xviii. 3), that Tyre was founded in the year preceding the capture of Troy, this would put that event about 1210 B.C. Merenptah's reign on this reckoning would fall towards the end of the century. Tyre is said to have been founded 240 years before the Temple (Josephus, on Tyrian authority; *Ant. Jud.*, viii. 3).

¹ The grounds of this reckoning are carefully investigated in an article by the present writer on "Assyrian and Hebrew Chronology," in *The Presbyterian Review* for January, 1889. Smith's *Bible Dictionary* (new edition), in art. "Chronology," suggests 965 B.C.

² Compare Canon Cook's "Essay," dealing with the *higher* reckoning, p. 470.

Petrie in fullest confidence does in writing on this inscription, is, on the face of it, to put Merenptah out of court as the Pharaoh of the Exodus.

There is another aspect of the subject, however, not always attended to, in view of which this identification of Merenptah with the Pharaoh of the Exodus is seen to fail chronologically. If the chronology will not suit in a downward direction, as little will it suit in an upward. Archæological discovery has now enabled us to fix with an approach to certainty the date of Abraham, through his connection with Chedorlaomer.¹ Taking the lowest date for this ruler, we may place his invasion of Canaan about 2100 B.C.² From this to 1200 B.C., the supposed date of the Exodus, is 900 years. But no stretch of calculation, which pays any regard to Biblical data, can make out this interval between Abraham and the Exodus. The scriptural indications give us at most about 650 years. Here, then, the Exodus is placed some 250 years too low, and would be too low even if Merenptah were placed a century higher. Both from above and below, therefore, the theory which puts the Exodus in the 19th dynasty breaks down chronologically. Against these growing impossibilities, the argument, plausible as it seems, based on the mention of Pithom and Raamses, must give way.³

We advance now a step further, and proceed to substantiate an assertion made earlier, that it is under the 18th dynasty, not under the 19th, that the Exodus, or what passes for it, is placed by Manetho, and nearly all the old authorities. The opposite is frequently alleged, but we

¹ Gen. xiv.

² Thus, *e.g.*, Conder in *The Bible and the East*, p. 29; others, as Sayce place it higher.

³ It will be necessary to assume,—a view not without support and probability—that Rameses II. enlarged and improved older cities. Rameses was apparently the name of a district before it was the name of a city, and so is mentioned in the life of Jacob (Gen. xlvii. 11). Compare Canon Cook's "Essay," p. 466, 486.

shall see immediately with how little reason.¹ The confusion and corruption of these old notices and lists, preserved by Josephus and the ecclesiastical historians, are known to every student of the subject, but we shall not plunge further here than we can help into this thicket.² A few points, however, stand out fairly clear. Our attention is naturally first directed to the two passages from Manetho, quoted by Josephus as having a bearing on the Exodus. These are,—

1. The account of the expulsion of the Hyksos from Egypt by a king Tethmosis, whom no one doubts to belong to the 18th dynasty.³

2. The story of the expulsion of the lepers by Amenophis.⁴ This Amenophis it is customary to identify with Merenptah. But, in the first place, Amenophis is not naturally Merenptah (Menephtah, in the lists ἀμμενεφθῆς, with variants);⁵ and next, it is not observed that Manetho gives a further statement about the king he means, which absolutely fixes him down to the 18th dynasty. He had an adviser, he tells us, of the same name with himself—Amenophis, the son of Paapios, a man of extraordinary wisdom. This is evidently no other than the famous Amenhotep, the son of Hapis, who bore this character, and rose to the highest honours, in the court of Amenhotep III., in the 18th dynasty.⁶ The Sethos (called also Rampses), following this Amenophis in the story, must be identified with the Seti at the *beginning*

¹ Canon Cook in his "Essay" takes a similar view, though his line is different from ours. "The Exodus," he says, "is assumed by all ancient chronologers, who derived their information from Egyptian sources, to have taken place under the 18th dynasty (pp. 451-2).

² The texts are given in Müller's *Fragmenta Hist. Græcorum*, which we use as our authority.

³ *Contra Apion*, i. 14.

⁴ *C. A.*, i. 26.

⁵ Amenophis for Merenptah in Josephus, *C. A.*, i. 15, where Africanus and Eusebius have as above, is probably a corruption; so in Canon of Eusebius (not Chronicon).

⁶ See Brugsch, *Hist. of Egypt*, i. pp. 423-6; Flinders Petrie, ii. p. 196.

of the 19th dynasty, not with Seti II. after Merneptah.¹ Names and dates throughout are in sorriest confusion, but the story is evidently an 18th dynasty one.

The other notices agree with this result. Chæremon gives another version of the leper story in which the Israelites are led out by Joseph and Moses (!), and the king also is Amenophis.² Eusebius put the Exodus for some reason a little later, under a king Achencheres, but still under the 18th dynasty.³ The one absurd exception is the foolish story of Lysimachus, who puts the Exodus under Bocchoris, of the 24th dynasty (!)⁴

We are not, however, yet quite done with Manetho. It is commonly assumed that the confusion of the Israelites with the Hyksos, or shepherd kings, belongs solely to Josephus, and is not shared by Manetho, whose narrative the historian misunderstands. This is, to say the least, doubtful. If we could depend on the genuineness of another quotation which Josephus gives from Manetho, "The nation, thus called shepherds, was also called captives in their sacred books,"⁵ it would put the matter beyond doubt. It is not an improbable hypothesis that Manetho merged the Israelites among the other nomads whom he groups under the designation Hyksos, and regards their exodus as the last act in the expulsion of the latter.⁶ The language he employs in describing their departure bears a singular re-

¹ The statements from Manetho in Josephus, etc., about this Sethos and Rameses cannot be harmonized. Sometimes the two are brothers; sometimes the same person with different names; now they are placed after Merneptah (19th dynasty); again (in Eusebius, etc.) before Merneptah. In Manetho's leper-story Sethos appears in quite another series of events.

² Josephus, *C. A.*, i. 32.

³ Cf. Josephus, *C. A.*, i. 15; Flinders Petrie, *Hist.*, ii. p. 28. Syncellus says that Eusebius in this stands in contradiction with all other authorities (Müller, p. 578).

⁴ *C. A.*, i. 33.

⁵ *C. A.*, i. 14.

⁶ Dr. Naville shows that the expulsion of the Hyksos took place gradually, and continued as late as Thothmes III. *Transactions of Vict. Institute*, July 5, 1889.

semblance in many ways to the Scripture narrative. He tells how they were shut up by a king whom he calls Alisphragmuthosis¹ in a place named Avaris ; how his son Thummosis (or Tethmosis), failing to dislodge them, came to an agreement with them that they should leave Egypt, and go whithersoever they would ; how after this they went away with their whole families and effects, not fewer than 240,000 in number, and took their journey from Egypt, through the wilderness, for Syria ; and how they built a great city in the country now called Judæa, and named it Jerusalem.”² Nor does this conflict with the leper story, accurately read, for this latter folds back on the previous narrative, and describes help as being sought “from those who had been driven out of the land by Tethmosis to the city called Jerusalem,”³ who sent 200,000 men to aid the revolution of Osarsiph. It is more than likely that this second story, so far as it has any basis in fact, is a confused reminiscence of some purely native Egyptian event, and does not refer to the Exodus at all. The awkward mention of Moses at the end may well, in that case, be the result of interpolation.

A glance may be taken, finally, before passing to a positive statement, at the *time* when Manetho supposes this peaceable departure of a large body of his shepherds for Judæa (which Josephus, with some justice, identifies with the Exodus) to happen. The king is Tethmosis, and his father bears the name of Alisphragmuthosis, or more correctly Misphragmuthosis, as given by Eusebius.⁴ The confusion of order in the lists of the 18th dynasty, as compared with the monuments, is great, but this is evidently

¹ This is in all probability a simple misreading for Misphragmuthosis, as given in Eusebius (Armen. and Syncellus)—a supposition which solves some difficulties ; and is again equivalent to Misptra-Tuthmosis. Thus Müller, *Fragmenta*, pp. 567, 588.

² *C. A.*, i. 14 ; cf. i. 26.

³ This view has been suggested by several writers.

⁴ See note above.

the king who appears with the same title 6th or 7th in the lists, and whom Prof. Flinders Petrie identifies with Amenhotep II. The Tethmosis, in this case, would be Thothmes IV. It seems to us more probable that the long designation is a reduplication of the name of the great king Thothmes III., who immediately precedes (Misphra-Tuthmosis), and that Amenhotep II. is somehow omitted.¹ The king of the Exodus, therefore, will be one of the immediate successors of Thothmes III., viz., Amenhotep II., or Thothmes IV., a result the bearings of which will be seen directly. If, now, these same two names are found in Josephus's list at the *beginning* of the 18th dynasty, in place of the Amos (Aahmes) of Africanus, Eusebius, and the monuments, and so appear twice, this is explained by the fact that it was under Aahmes that the expulsion of the shepherds began, and some corrector may have thought that this was the proper place for the names to be introduced.

We now hasten to a brief statement of the positive suggestions we are disposed to make for a solution of this question, in harmony with the monumental evidence. Let us take first the indications which the Biblical books themselves afford, and see whither they lead. We begin with the categorical statement in 1 Kings vi. 1 that 480 years had elapsed from the Exodus to the founding of the Temple in the fourth year of Solomon.² The date is checked somewhat by the round 300 years given in Judges xi. 26 as the term to the days of Jephthah, showing at least that the Hebrews had a serious method of reckoning for the great events of their history. Starting, then, with 969 B.C. as

¹ The succession is Misaphris, Misphris, or Mephres, which most agree is Thothmes III.; then this Misphragmuthosis, or Mephramuthosis. Similar reduplications occur later in the lists. Cf. Flinders Petrie, *Hist. of Egypt*, ii. pp. 25-29. The suggestion of a reduplication is made in *The Theological Monthly* for March, 1889.

² We are aware of the doubts which attach to this number (the Septuagint, *e.g.*, gives 440, and Josephus, etc., do not mention it). But these doubts may be carried too far, and it is only fair to give the number a trial.

the date of the founding of the Temple, or taking it, with some high authorities, a few years later, about 965 B.C., we are brought approximately to 1445 B.C. as the period of the Exodus. Starting, again, on the upper side, from the date of Chedorlaomer, which we take, as before, at about 2100 B.C., and accepting 650 years or thereby as the Biblical interval from Abraham to the Exodus, we are brought to almost exactly the same point, 1450 B.C. This coincidence is a striking one, and suggests that we cannot be far wrong on either side. Taking next the Biblical *datum* for the duration of the sojourn in Egypt, 430 years,¹ and reckoning upwards, we get approximately 1880 B.C. for the descent into Egypt. We have now to compare these figures with the data of the monuments, and observe what synchronisms they yield. The results will prove sufficiently striking.

We have seen that the astronomical calculations of Dr. Mahler, confirming those of others, have succeeded in fixing with tolerable certainty the dates of Thothmes III., the most powerful Pharaoh of the 18th dynasty.² The years of his *sole* reign, as given in Prof. Petrie's table, are from 1481 B.C. to 1449 B.C. On this showing, our date for the Exodus would fall in the first years of his successor, Amenhotep II., and it is at least singular that though this monarch had an ascertained reign of over twenty-five years, "no monuments are dated above the fifth year—of the remainder of his reign we know nothing."³ It will be observed that this also is precisely the period in which Manetho places the departure of the shepherds who made their way to Judæa. Those who put the Exodus in the next reign, that of Thothmes IV., have the support of his Tethmosis; but

¹ Exod. xii. 40, 41.

² The succession of reigns in this dynasty was as follows: Aahmes, Amenhotep I., Thothmes I., II., III., Amenhotep II., Thothmes IV., Amenhotep III., Amenhotep IV. (Khunaten), etc.

³ Flinders Petrie, *Hist. of Egypt*, ii. pp. 155-7.

if, as we conjecture, his Misphragmuthosis is no other than Thothmes III., then the son of the latter would be, not Thothmes IV., but Amenhotep II., whom Manetho seems to omit. Meanwhile, we ask attention to our remaining date—that of the Descent into Egypt. According to all ancient testimony, Joseph went down into Egypt in the reign of the Shepherd King Apophis, or Apepi, whom it is customary to identify with the king of that name at the close of the Shepherd dynasty. The difficulty in this is—apart from the general chronology—that it would make Joseph outlive the great revolution which overthrew that dynasty, and established the 18th under Aahmes—a most improbable supposition. The Hyksos period, however, is now better understood, and it seems well ascertained that the six kings in the list of Josephus belong, not to the end, but to the *commencement* of the Shepherd rule.¹ There was, in fact, as the monuments show, an Apepi I., as well as an Apepi II., and when we turn to Prof. Petrie's table to find the dates of this older Apepi, when the Shepherd rule was in its prime, and extended over all Egypt, we find them given as 1898 B.C. to 1837 B.C., *i.e.*, again, precisely the period within which, on our reckoning, the life of Joseph, and the Descent into Egypt (1880 B.C.) fall. Coincidences so remarkable are surely not quite accidental.

Let us return for a moment to the reigns of Thothmes III., and of Amenhotep II., his son. If the Exodus falls, as we have placed it, in the first years of Amenhotep II., then the great Thothmes will take the place of Rameses II. as the oppressor of the Hebrews. Few who have read the annals of his reign will doubt that the conditions of the Israelitish history are fulfilled in it in a remarkable degree. A mighty builder, warrior, and conqueror, whose total reign extended through the long period of fifty-four years, he is exactly the kind of personage depicted for us in the Book of Exodus.

¹ C. A., i. 15. This, indeed, Josephus himself says.

It is to his reign, as is well known, that the famous tomb-picture of the brick-making by captives belongs, so often used as an illustration of the labours of the oppressed Israelites. The overseers are armed with sticks, and one of them speaks to the labourers, "The stick is in my hand, be not idle."¹ Many sunburnt bricks, bearing the stamp of Thothmes, have been discovered made without straw, whereas ordinarily chopped straw is used.² But there are other coincidences of this reign even more remarkable. For the lengthened period of thirty-five years, since the death of Thothmes I., the government of Egypt had been practically controlled by a woman—the bold and energetic Hatasu. This princess was first associated with her own father, Thothmes I., in the government; then, on his death, became the wife and consort of her feeble half-brother, Thothmes II.; lastly, exercised the government for over twenty years in association with her other brother (or nephew), Thothmes III., dying about 1481.³ This, in the first place, gives a remarkable continuity to the government for some eighty years before the Exodus, strikingly in agreement with the indications in the history; and, secondly, one can hardly help seeing in it a remarkable coincidence with the prominence there given to "Pharaoh's daughter" in the deliverance and upbringing of Moses. If Moses was, as commonly supposed, about eighty years old at the time of the Exodus, his birth would fall in the later years of Thothmes I., when Hatasu, his daughter—who at the time of association in rule "was about twenty-four years of age, of great capacity and power"⁴—was just attaining to woman-

¹ Brugsch, *Hist. of Egypt*, i. pp. 375-6.

² Palmer, *Egyptian Chronicles*, i. pp. 194-5. But such bricks are not confined to this reign or period; they are found, *e.g.*, at Pithom.

³ See on her reign and character, Petrie, *Hist. of Egypt*, ii. pp. 79-96.

⁴ Petrie, *Hist. of Egypt*, p. 95. Moses' flight to Midian would, on this view, be close on the time of her death, when Thothmes III. was taking the full reins of power into his own hands.

hood. A more exact correspondence could not be conceived. As respects Amenhotep II., it is to be observed that he was yet young at his father's death—probably not above eighteen, and would consequently be about twenty-five years of age at the date we assume for the Exodus.¹ This decease of an old and powerful king, and the accession of one young and inexperienced, yet vain-glorious over his early expeditions and victories—as the monuments show him to have been—again suits well the conditions pictured in Exodus ii. 23, and following chapters.² As remarked above, the monuments preserve an unbroken silence on the events of his reign after the fifth year, though a wine-jar, dated in his twenty-sixth year, shows that the twenty-five years ten months assigned him by Manetho are not too long for his rule. He had several sons, but it is at least worth noticing “that unhappily all their names have been erased” from the monument that records them, except that of Thothmes IV., his successor.³

If the considerations we have advanced have, in their combination, any weight, their interest assuredly is not lessened by one coincidence yet to be mentioned. We have glanced at the bearings of our assumed date for the Exodus in an upward direction, and have seen its agreement with the time of Chedorlaomer, and the Descent into Egypt. When we look downwards, passing the unimportant reign of Thothmes IV., to the reign of his successors, Amenhotep III. and Amenhotep IV., we find ourselves, within a few

¹ He was born at Memphis, where the Court at this time sometimes had its residence (Petrie, *Hist. of Egypt*, ii. p. 162).

² On the other hand, the reign of Merenptah, as we now know it, seems eminently unsuitable for the Exodus. It was marked in its fifth year by the successful repelling of a great tempest of foreign invasion; this was followed by a period of marked tranquillity and security; in his eighth year, tribes from Edom were welcomed to settle in Succoth, etc.

³ Flinders Petrie, *Hist. of Egypt*, ii. pp. 154, 165. Amenhotep claims Palestine as a captive country (p. 157), which would give an upward limit by showing that the Israelites were not in Canaan then.

decades from our Exodus date, in the midst of the period on which such a flood of light has recently been cast by the recovered cuneiform correspondence of Tell-el-Amarna. It will be in itself a most interesting result if it should turn out, as probably it will, that this period of intense literary activity, and active communication between Egypt and Canaan, was not, as has been supposed, some century and a half before the Exodus, but was the very age of the Exodus itself.¹ On our hypothesis, the correspondence between Ebed-Tob of Jerusalem and the "heretic" king, Amen-hotep IV., or Khunaten, would synchronise with the events described in Joshua or the early chapters of Judges. But just here we come on the remarkable fact—to which Conder and others have justly called attention—that these letters of the king of Jerusalem are full of appeals, and of expressions of terror occasioned by the resistless advance of a fierce people whom he calls 'Abiri, or *Khabiri*, coming from Seir, reducing to tribute the Canaanitish towns, and overturning the power of Egypt in Jerusalem and in the Philistine plains.² Flinders Petrie, Sayce, and others translate *Khabiri* simply by "confederates,"³ but Colonel Conder translates it boldly by "Hebrews," and observes, "It appears, therefore, that the 'Abiri conquest was not a mere local rising; it was the invasion of a people from the land of the 'Abiri, who came from Seir, and who destroyed all the rulers, and apparently wrecked the Canaanite temples. They refused to give tribute, and swept over all the country of Judah as far as Carmel, south of Hebron. . . . The tone of all the Canaanite letters is a despairing cry for help to Egypt, but

¹ The bearing cannot be overlooked in the composition of the literary sources of the Pentateuch.

² See the passages quoted in Conder's *The Bible and the East*, pp. 40, 41, 103-7; also *Tell Amarna Tablets*, pp. 141-57.

³ See *Hist. of Egypt*, p. 315. Prof. Petrie says, "The name points, therefore, to Hebron . . . Hebron was so named between the time of Abraham's visit and the Exodus." But this is hardly so. The name was Kirjath-Arba up to the time of the Conquest (Judges i. 10, etc.).

none of them record that any help was sent, though eagerly expected. They relate no victories over the 'Abiri, and the history of the reign of Amenophis IV. shows us only defeat and disaster."¹ Dr. Steindorff, a leading Egyptologist, in his recent notice,² thinks that the new discovery gives higher probability to the conjecture that the *Khabiri* are identical with the Hebrews. It is too early yet to say how this controversy will settle itself, but the indications, so far as they go, tally well with our hypothesis.

Here we are content to leave the issue. There is probably no single point we have advanced to which, in the divergent state of Egyptological opinion, exception of some kind may not be taken; but the same may be said with confidence of any theory that can be proposed. It is evident that the force of an argument of this kind lies largely in the connection of points as a whole, and in fairness this should be kept in view in judging of it. It is possible that, as Colonel Conder and others think, the Exodus may have taken place a little later than we put it—in the reign of Thothmes IV., but we think the conditions are better fulfilled in the previous reign. An earlier date, as in the reign of Thothmes II. (Canon Cook's hypothesis), seems precluded by the relations of the Pharaohs to Palestine; and those who adopted this date were usually led to it by too high a date for the founding of the Temple.³ The possibilities, if the Exodus is to be relegated to the 18th dynasty at all, lie within very narrow limits, and we have given reasons which seem to us of no little force for placing it where we do.

JAMES ORR.

¹ pp. 41, 106. The conjecture that the Khabiri were Hebrews was originally Dr. H. Zimmern's. Conder's suggestion was made independently in *Quart. Statement of Pal. Ex. Fund*, June, 1891. He thinks the term derived from the 'Abarim, or mountains E. of Jordan (*Tell Amarna Tablets*, p. 141).

² See *Zeitschrift für die alttest. Wissenschaft*, 1896, 2nd Part, p. 333.

³ 1012 B.C., since modified by Assyriological discovery.

A CRITICISM OF DR. HATCH'S "ESSAYS IN BIBLICAL GREEK," BY DR. HORT. (A FRAGMENT.)

p. 199. (On Isa. xlii. 1-4.) Dr. Hort writes, "Justin has nothing which is not in either LXX. or Mt. except (1) (once) *και* before *Ἰσραήλ*; (2) *προσδέξεται* instead of (LXX.) *προσεδέξατο*, a natural assimilation to *ἀντιλήψομαι*; and (3) *ἐκλεκτοῦ μου* for *ὁ ἐκλεκτός μου, προσεδέξατο κτλ*, which keeps the chief points."

p. 200. (Same passage continued.) Dr. Hort writes, "Again all is in LXX. and Mt.": and on the statement "the quotation must be from Isaiah and not from St. Matthew," "Nay, *contendit* proves the quotation to be mixed"; adding just below, "Again *De pat. 3, non contendit, non reclamavit*, but *in plateis* follows."

p. 201. (Same passage continued.) "LXX. exactly translates Hebrew. The confusion is in the Hebrew text, not the Greek."

p. 207 f. Dr. Hatch conjectures that "the present reading of the LXX. [in Psalm cxviii. (cxix.) 120, '*καθήλωσον ἐκ τοῦ φόβου σου τὰς σάρκας μου*'] is due to a scribe's recollection of the composite psalm which Barnabas here [c.v.] quotes, or possibly adapts."

This conjecture provokes a threefold note of admiration, and is undermined by the remark, "Both LXX. and Aquila simply follow the rabbinical instead of the Biblical sense of the verb *רָצַף* ('bristles' = 'nails')."

p. 209. The suggestion as to the quotation of Isaiah xl. 12 is disposed of in the words, "Only a natural reduction to simple antithesis, heaven and earth"; and it is pointed out that the quotation from c. lxvi. 1 agrees, "as far as it goes, with Acts vii. 49 (*ἡ δέ* for *καὶ ἡ* in all MSS. but B)."

p. 211 (2). Dr. Hatch speaks of "unknown sources" of the quotation in *Tryph.*, 24. Dr. Hort writes below:

"(1). Psalm cxxviii. (cxxvii.) 4, 5, *ἰδοὺ οὕτως εὐλογηθήσεται ἄνθρωπος ὁ φοβούμενος τὸν Κύριον*. *Εὐλογῆσαι σε Κύριος ἐκ Σιών, καὶ ἰδοὺ τὰ ἀγαθὰ Ἱερουσαλήμ πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς ζωῆς σου* (cp. Ps. xxxiv. (xxxiii.) 11, 12, *Δεῦτε τέκνα, ἀκούσατέ μου, φόβον Κυρίου διδάξω ὑμᾶς. Τίς ἐστὶν ἄνθρωπος ὁ θέλων ζῶναι, ἀγαπῶν ἰδεῖν ἡμέρας ἀγαθῆς*);

"(2). Jeremiah iii. 17, . . . καλέσουσι τὴν Ἱερουσαλήμ θρόνον Κυρίου, καὶ συναχθήσονται πάντα τὰ ἔθνη εἰς αὐτήν.

p. 212. (On the same passage.) Dr. Hatch's remarks on the sense in which ἀνῆκε is used by Justin and LXX. respectively are modified by a note pointing out that in Isaiah ii. 9 ἀνίημι is used even more exactly than in Justin in the sense of "pardon" (οὐ μὴ ἀνήσω αὐτούς) for the verb נָשַׁח; and that ἀνίημι often means "release."

Just afterwards Dr. Hort thinks it "very doubtful" whether Justin, quoting Isaiah ii. 5, 6 in *Tryph.*, 135, did take ἀνῆκε in the sense of "forsook": "he probably had in mind the *new* house of Jacob."

Dr. Hort has no notes on chapter vi. "on Origen's Revision of the LXX. Text of Job."

p. 247. Opposite the words near the foot of the page "dated A.D. 734" Dr. Hort has written "1434."

p. 256. (On Ecclesiasticus xx. 27, 28.) The last word of the Greek is corrected to ἀδικίαν. Dr. Hatch's view that "the fifth line of the Latin is out of harmony" is questioned. "Rather it carries on the second line. Acceptableness to great people gives opportunities of increasing one's store, and so by alms getting atonement for sins. The fourth Latin line comes in very badly with its morality among the [maxims of] prudence. It seems to represent a duplicate rendering of the preceding line (ὁ ἐργαζόμενος γῆν ἀνυψώσει θημωνίαν αὐτοῦ). Probably רִצְוֹ, 'righteousness,' was read for רִצְוֵי, 'a heap' (of corn), rendered θημωνία."

p. 257. The remark at the foot of the page as to "triplication" extorts "???" and the sentence which follows ("The hypothesis is supported," etc.) "Why?"

p. 258. Dr. Hatch's treatment of the fourth couplet (of Ecclus. xxviii. 3-7) is not approved, "Rather καταφθορὰ καὶ θάνατος [καὶ] ἐμμένει ἐντολαῖς. *Imminet*, i.e. *immanet*, by its unmotived singular points to ἐμμένει." Dr. Hatch writes *imminent* all through.

The paragraph in which Dr. Hatch states his conclusion as to the whole passage is marked "??".

p. 258. (On Ecclus. i. 13.) Dr. Hort is very doubtful about ἐιλογηθήσεται being clearly the true reading. He points out that in the Hebrew of iv. 16 εἰρήσει χάριν does occur absolutely, "and is not contrary to analogy; while it might easily be a stumbling block" [to a scribe].

p. 259. (On i. 23.) Dr. Hatch regards εὐφροσύνη as grammatically impossible because it involves a neuter sense for ἀναδώσει. Dr. Hort remarks, "Neuter senses are common for compounds of δίδωμι; and ἀναδίδωμι has more than one such. The image here may either be [that] of a fountain or [that] of a springing plant."

p. 260. (On iv. 11.) "The Latin seems to show that the Greek verb was originally ἐψύχωσε or ἐνεψύχωσε" (Hatch).

"How can it show more than that this was its own Greek original?" (Hort).

"ἐνεφυσίωσε [ἐνεφύσησε?]" (Hatch).

"No, the whole context most clearly confirms ἐνεφυσίωσεν" (Hort).

ib. (On iv. 15.) Dr. Hort does not accept either statements of fact or deductions. "*Adquiescit* is more likely to be a paraphrase of προσέρχεται. The sense is exactly given in *accedit*, the first of two renderings in *g.*"

ib. (On v. 6.) "But surely ταχυνεῖ was meant to ease the genitive παρ' αὐτοῦ, while it really weakens and changes the sense" (Hort). Dr. Hatch would read ταχυνεῖ.

p. 261. (On v. 6.) "The exegetical difficulty of the verse lies in ἔλεος," etc. (Hatch).

"Nay, the point is that from God proceeds not mercy only, as the sinner assumes, but both mercy and wrath" (Hort).

ib. "The clause ἔλεος γὰρ καὶ ὀργὴ παρ' αὐτοῦ is found also in xvi. 12, where the mention of mercy as well as wrath is quite appropriate" (Hatch).

"Not more than here. See the preceding and following lines in c. 16" (Hort).

p. 262. (On vii. 18.) "The original text of the LXX. was thus, in all probability, μὴ ἀλλάξῃς φίλον διαφόρον" (Hatch).

"Probably, but not *because* the Latin and Syriac so read. There is, however, no reason to reject ἐνεκεν" (Hort).

p. 262. (On x. 17.) "To wither up is surely not a 'mild word' or inappropriate here: cf. Isaiah xl. 24, li. 12; Joel i. 11; Zechariah x. 2 (of men); Job xii. 15 (prob.); Isaiah xlii. 14; Jeremiah xxiii. 10; Amos i. 2 (of the land). Ἐξ αὐτῶν may well mean 'some of them.'"

ib. (On x. 27.) "The reading of (B) 155 is assuredly right. (B differs only by the mechanical insertion of a second ἦ after the ων [of περιπατῶν].) The forcible phrase 'working in all things'

was not understood, and some substituted *πόνοις* for *πᾶσιν*, while others inserted *καὶ περισσεύων* before *ἐν πᾶσιν*. So also the force of *περιπατῶν* (as a contrast to *ἐργαζόμενος*) being missed, it was turned out as otiose, and awkward with a second participle" (Hort).

p. 263. "The Latin and Syriac show that Codd. 23, 248, have preserved the original text" (Hatch).

"How can they?" (Hort).

ib. (On xi. 9). Dr. Hatch would reject *χρεία*. Dr. Hort writes: "The subject of verses 7-9 is excessive haste to speak or interfere. Hence *χρεία* means 'need for thee to join in the dispute' (practically 'concern of thine'). So xxxv. 7, *Δάλλησον νεανίσκε, εἰ χρεία σου*; cf. iii. 22, *οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶ σοι χρεία τῶν κρυπτῶν*."

p. 264. (On xii. 12.) On Dr. Hatch's suggestion, that the order in which the phrases occur in the Latin points to two of them being glosses, Dr. Hort says, "Yet many might think it a more natural order to have parallel lines rather than parallel couplets: and the Latin often transposes."

ib. Just below Dr. Hatch writes, "The earliest text is probably that of St. August., *Speculum*, p. 130," on which Dr. Hort exclaims, "Why, it is the Vulgate!"

p. 265. (On xii. 12.) To account for the variants *ἀναστρέψας* and *ἀνατρέψας* Dr. Hatch says, "It may be supposed that the common use of the verb in the LXX. as a neuter was unknown to some of the Greek scribes." On the words "in the LXX.," Dr. Hort annotates, "as in all Greek literature."

On the same passage Dr. Hort writes further: "*ἀναστρέψας σε* gives much the more forcible sense, *ἀνατρέψας* the more obvious."

p. 265. (On xiv. 20.) "The original reading was clearly *μελετήσῃ* = 'meditabitur'" (Hatch).

"Plausible, certainly: but the evidence is suspicious; and what would suggest *τελευτήσῃ*? More probably *τελευτήσῃ* is a mis-translation, *מַחַר* or (Aram.) *ללח* read as *מח*.

p. 266. (On xv. 6.) Dr. Hort writes: "Nay, *ἀνοίξει* in 5^b may have either (*a*) Wisdom, or (*b*) the man, for its subject. *a* has precedents in Ezekiel (iii. 27, xxiv. 27, xxxiii. 22; cf. Psalm l. 17, *χειλή* for *στόμα*), but is rare, and in Ecclesiasticus contrary to large usage. But the previous context might easily suggest it to scribes. Hence two parallel attempts to supply a verb, *εὐρήσῃ* on the (right) base of *b*; *thesaurizabit super* and *hereditabit illum* (causative) on the base of *a*."

Dr. Hatch's conjecture to account for *εῖρήσει* is pronounced "most unlikely"; and his assertion that "*av* was a not uncommon error for *ευ*" provokes the question, "Does it ever occur?"

p. 266. (On xvi. 3.) τὸ πλῆθος, pronounced by Dr. Hatch "almost certain," is regarded by Dr. Hort as "surely a manifest correction. After verses 1 and 2 very bald."

Dr. Hatch cites C as reading ἐπὶ τὸν τόπον αὐτῶν. Dr. Hort notes that in C there is a hiatus at this point.

ib. (On xvi. 17.) Dr. Hort disagrees. "Μῆ has much greater force than καί. This line gives the reason for Ἀπό, etc., just as [verse] 4 does for [verse] 3."

p. 267. (On xvi. 18.) Dr. Hort cites Psalm cxiii. 24 (cxv. 16, Heb.), ὁ οὐρανὸς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τῷ Κυρίῳ τὴν δὲ γῆν ἔδωκεν τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων, and asks, "Why should it not be a parallelism of contrast, as in the Psalm?"

p. 267. (On xviii. 32.) Dr. Hort writes: "Latin probably read *τρυφῆ* as *τύρβη* and wrote 'in turbis immodicis.' A scribe reading this as 'in modicis' would naturally insert 'nec': this once being there, 'delecteris' would be an easy addition. The resemblance to 'comissatio' must be fallacious, though *συμβολή* sometimes has nearly this meaning (see my note in interleaved Fritzsche), as probably here. 'Commissio' is the exact etymological rendering of *συμβολή*, and gives some of its senses, e.g. a competition, with which 'adsidua' (? *προσεχής*) might naturally go. Προσδεθῆναι is elsewhere joined with *τρυφῆ* and with *ἡδονῆ* (see my note). But it is a hard verse."

p. 268. (On xix. 22.) Dr. Hort notes that the passage runs καὶ οὐκ ἔστι σοφία πονηρίας ἐπιστήμη, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν [ὄπου] βουλή ἀμαρτωλῶν φρόνησις: and in reply to the doubt thrown on ὄπου by Dr. Hatch he writes: "Yet Ecclesiasticus is fond of ὄπου in this scarcely local sense; and it is useful here, to mark the change of order (ἀμαρτωλῶν with βουλή, not with φρόνησις; though πονηρίας with ἐπιστήμη, not with σοφία). The omission of ὄπου was inevitable after οὐκ ἔστι σοφία."

(On xxi. 17.) [διανοηθήσεται is] "doubtless an individualism of B, an easy assimilation."

p. 268f. (On xxii. 27.) Dr. Hort again draws a line through C. He notes that instead of *certum* Augustine has *astutum* (as the Vulgate has *astutia* for πανούργημα or πανούργημα). For *cer-*

tum he suggests *cautum*. He observes that *πανούργος* is used by Polybius also in the sense of "clever," and that "the fact that it is always used in the LXX. of persons and not of things" (Hatch) is a reason why scribes should change *πανούργων* into *πανούργων*. He adds, "A prudent seal" makes better sense.

p. 269. (On xxiii. 10.) Again C struck out. Dr. Hort attaches no weight to "the antithetical clause *οικέτης ἐξεταζόμενος*" as indicating a single participle in the clause adduced. "Why match exactly?" he asks. And he adds, "Surely the omission of *καὶ ὀνομάζων* and the addition of *τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου* are only different evasions of the difficulty of *καὶ ὀνομάζων* absolute." He indicates astonishment at the suggestion made to account for "the loss of the words *τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου* in most MSS."

p. 270. (On xxv. 17.) "*ἄρκος* (= *ἄρκτος*) is unintelligible" (Hatch).

"Why not 'as grim as a bear'?" (Hort).

"It can hardly be doubted that the original reading was *ἄρκος*" (Hatch).

This remark elicits two notes of astonishment.

"*σάκκον* has probably the same sense as *ἄρκος*" (Hatch).

Double query (Hort).

"It was a cloth," etc. (Hatch).

"Rather, a bag or sack. See Blümner, *Priv. Alt.*, 194, 3; Becker, *Char.*, ii. 393f. But the evidence is very slight" (Hort).

Apoc. vi. 12, *ὁ ἥλιος ἐγένετο μέλας ὡς σάκκος τρίχινος*. Cf. Isaiah l. 3 (quotes Dr. Hort).

"Why not simply—

N

ΩC CAKKOC

ΩC APKOC

?" (Hort).

p. 271. (On xxv. 17.) On "taking it for an accusative" (l. 3) Dr. Hort says: "Surely quite possible, though *σάκκος* may be more likely."

On "drawn over it" (l. 7), he notes: "But in Greek usage, it was for the hair only."

(On xxv. 21.) C again disappears.

On "inadequately balanced" Dr. Hort writes: "only in number of words, not in meaning." *In specie* is "perhaps a double of

ἐπὶ κάλλος." εἰς τρυφήν is "surely interpolated for explicitness (as ἐξόδου below, v. 25)."

p. 271. (On xxv. 25.) Dr. Hort's note is: "Possibly, and this would not exclude speech: but v. 25 suggests a more comprehensive sense. Cf. Prov. xvii. 14, Heb. (Oddly ἐξουσίαν...λόγους, LXX.) Surely it implies ἐξόδου." ["It," *i.e.*, I suppose, the Latin. "This," *viz.*, ἐξουσίαν, I imagine.]

p. 272. (On xxvii. 27.) The statement that "the reading of Cod. B (ὁ ποιῶν πονηρὰ εἰς αὐτὸν κολισθήσεται) is grammatically impossible," calls forth a note of astonishment. "For εἰς see Wahl 160*b* fin., 161*a* (sp. εἰς κεφαλῆν)."

p. 280. (On xlv. 17.) Dr. Hort says: "Rather B₄ is a corruption of B₃: the duplicates are variously combined, and the reading of N² and A¹ is ingeniously wrong."

THE CHRISTIAN PROMISE OF EMPIRE.

REVELATION iii. 21.

"To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with Me in My throne." These words bear the stamp of their environment. They were written at a time when the ideal of all men was the possession of a throne. Alike to the Roman and to the Jew the dream of life was the dream of dominion. The son of Israel contemplated his Messiah who should make him ruler over all nations. The son of Rome was eager to complete his almost finished work of universal empire. So far the promise was in harmony with the place and with the hour. But from another point of view it was in striking contrast to both. Who were the men that claimed to be the recipients of this promise? A band of obscure slaves. To the proud Roman leading his armies to victory, to the proud Jew counting his ancestors by hundreds, there must have been something almost grotesque in the claim. Here was a company of men not yet dignified with the name of humanity—the butt of the satirist, the jest of the

poet, the neglect of the historian—spending their days in menial toil, passing their nights in outhouses or top-garrets, leaving their bodies to a pauper's grave. And yet, in the face of the civilised world these men make the claim to an empire compared to which the dreams of Cæsar grow pale. They aspire to a sceptre higher than the Latin race had ever aimed at—above ædile, prætor, consul, senate, emperor—above every name that is named to constitute authority. To sit on the judgment-throne of God, the throne before which all hearts are open, to have the last word in the criticism of human actions, to give a verdict on the deeds of man, from which in all the universe there can be no appeal—that is the aspiration of these Christian slaves. Must it not to the age in which they lived have appeared the presumption of insanity?

Nor is it only to a Roman age that the claim of this passage seems to suggest the idea of presumption. Must it not appear so at all times to every man? The throne, as I have said, is a throne of judgment. How can any human soul aspire to such a seat? Is not the state of the Christian one of humility? Does not the amount of the humility increase in proportion as the Christianity grows? Have not the most purely spiritual souls been precisely those most conscious of their sin? Is it not least of all any of these that we can think of as claiming such a distinction? It is in the incipient stages of the Christian life that we find ambition. Peter begins by asking a perpetual seat on the Mount; but he ends with the aspiration to be "clothed with humility." John begins with the desire for a position on the right hand of power; but he ends with the humble hope, "If we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins." These are the normal utterances of the Christian heart—the utterance of the heart of that man who wrote the passage before us. Does it not seem as if he had here been untrue to himself, and had reverted to

that old presumptuous standpoint from which in youth he had been dislodged by the influence of the Master's love?

But let us look deeper. I think we shall find that we have altogether mistaken the meaning of the passage, and that the John of the Apocalypse is nowhere more like the John of the Gospel than in his present claim to Christian empire. So far from being influenced by the old feeling of presumption, he is actuated by the direct desire to avoid that feeling. His position is, that, instead of being presumption to claim a seat on God's judgment throne, it is presumption that prevents the Church of Laodicea from having a right to claim it. If that Church would adopt more humility, it would be more entitled to a place on the throne. That this is the idea of the passage will, I think, be quite manifest if we look back to the opening of the message. Addressing the Laodicean Church in verse 17, the seer of Patmos says, "Thou sayest, I am rich, and increased with goods, and have need of nothing; and knowest not that thou art wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked." What is the state of mind here indicated? It is poverty unconscious of itself. It is the description of a Church which has no elements of strength within it, but which believes itself to be strong just because it has never been tried. Accordingly in verse 18 he says, "I counsel thee to buy of me gold tried in the fire, that thou mayest be rich." The Church had an enemy to overcome within her own bosom. That enemy was presumption—the ignorance of her own weakness. How was the enemy to be overcome? By that which revealed the weakness. Nothing could reveal the weakness but exposure to the fire. The glitter of the alloy would melt before the scorching flame of adversity, and then the Church, emerging out of the flame, would be fitted to be what it had now no right to be—the judge of human actions. Let us try to make this last point clear.

And first, let us consider that, as a matter of fact, every man has seated himself on a throne of judgment. The difference between the Christian and the non-Christian is not the occupation of a throne. It is that the occupation of the one is legal, and the occupation of the other usurped. Every man by nature has constituted himself the judge of other men. He has seated himself on a tribunal before which he calls his brethren to appear. As the stream of his contemporaries passes by, the books of the judgment are opened and the sentence of each is written. Some are dismissed with contempt, some with indignation, some with anger, some with indifference, some with repulsion, and some with that patronising commendation which is equivalent to censure. Before the natural man are gathered the representatives of all nations; he has proclaimed himself the judge of quick and dead.

But to all such the seer of Patmos exclaims, "Come down from that throne; you have no right to be there; you have not overcome." He tells them that until they have felt the temptations of their own nature they are in no condition to judge others. Not only have they no right to sentence their equals, they are not qualified even to judge those whom they call the lapsed masses. "What," says one, "do I ever steal? do I ever, like these violent people, put out my hand to take that which is not mine?" John answers that there are forms of stealing which take nothing, which can rob a man of his reputation by simply keeping silent when a word would save. "But," says another, "have I ever done such an uncultured thing as raise the hand to strike?" John answers, "Did you never strike *with* culture, *by reason of* your culture, through the very refinement which marks you out from the lapsed masses? are there not wounds which are inseparable from the gloved hand?" All this seems to be implied in the exhortation, "Anoint thine eyes with eye salve, that thou mayest see"—

cure the soreness of your own eyes before you criticise the soreness of others. And when he says, "I would thou wert cold or hot," he seems to take ground more general still. He implies that there is an absence of temptation which comes from sheer lukewarmness. There are those who are never led up into the wilderness for the simple reason that they are never led up into the Mount. They have a native sluggishness of heart which makes enthusiasm in any cause impossible. They make no allowance for errors arising out of worldly allurements. They themselves are incapable of being allured either by the day or by the night. They have all the negative qualities ascribed to the Church of Laodicea—qualities which free from great deeds of wrong as much as great deeds of right. The throne of judgment on which they sit is therefore a usurped throne. They have no claim to it. They do not possess the two sides of the question. They have set themselves to legislate in a cause in which they have only heard the pleadings of one advocate. They are called to condemn temptations, not because they themselves have conquered them, but because they have never felt them. They have not yet "overcome."

Now, the next question is, what would be the effect of what is here called overcoming—of vanquishing the temptation? It would clearly be to transform a throne of judgment into a throne of grace. For, be it observed, the value of overcoming is not the victory but the struggle. There are two ways in which a man may reach freedom from temptation—by innocence or by virtue, by never having known or by having known and vanquished. If mere freedom from temptation were the goal, we ought to be content with the first. What makes the overcoming better than the innocence is the fact that in struggle we learn our weakness, and that in learning our weakness the throne of judgment becomes a throne of mercy. The prophet of Israel is not afraid to apply the principle even to the sinless

“servant of God.” “He shall see of the travail of his soul, by the knowledge of it shall my righteous servant justify many.” The idea is that the knowledge of his own travail shall make him tender to others. In what sense such words can be understood of Him I shall presently consider. Meantime I note the fact that Paul has not scrupled in Galatians vi. 6 to name this principle distinctively “the law of Christ.” He calls on the spiritual to restore the fallen—not on the ground of their spirituality, but by that memory of human weakness which their own struggle has left behind. He tells them to bear one another’s burdens on the ground that each has had a burden of his own to bear—a burden which either still exists or has left in remembrance the traces of its power. He promises the throne to the spirit of meekness—to those who have washed their robes in blood and by the sight of their remaining scars are able to pity the wounds of the actual battlefield.

And now the passage takes a remarkable turn. To the inspired ear of the seer of Patmos the Christ who offers the conditions of empire is heard declaring that He Himself has reached empire by conforming to these conditions, “even as I also overcame and am set down with My Father on His throne.” There is something startling here. There seems at first sight to be no analogy between the case of Christ and the case of ordinary men. Ordinary men are sinners; Christ claims to be without sin. How can it be said that the Son of Man has been taught to be tender by realising through struggle the difficulty of being pure? Is there not to the Christian consciousness something revolting in the very statement and something impossible in the conception? Undoubtedly there is; but it is neither the statement nor the conception of the passage. For, let us consider the principle which John means to unfold. It is that no man is entitled to judge another until he has himself been tried in the fire. But what is the

fire? there lies all the question. "It is temptation," you say. Of course it is; but temptation to what? To sin? Not necessarily. There are as many forms of temptation as there are circumstances of life. Sin is only one form of temptation. I may be tempted without sin. If I come to two cross roads and have a struggle as to which I shall take, that is temptation. Whatever exposes human nature to a crisis of perplexity, whatever presents a conflict of motives to the soul of any man, that is his hour of trial. It may be a solicitation to sin; it may be a solicitation to love; it may be a solicitation to venture; so far as the revelation of human frailty is concerned, the cause is immaterial.

Now, Jesus was tempted; that is one of the cardinal features of the Gospel. He was tempted in such a way as to make Him feel the inherent weakness of humanity; that is one of the cardinal features of the Epistle to the Hebrews. But He was tempted also "without sin." What is the meaning of these words? They are popularly thought to mean that He did not *succumb* to the temptation. I do not think this is their significance. I take them to express the writer's conviction that the temptation of Jesus had in it no solicitation to sin, that it came in the form of a tendency to choose a short road to the path of goodness—the establishment of His kingdom. It was a wish to realise without death the Messianic expectation of His people. None the less, it was a temptation which involved for Him the most severe struggle. Why should death have seemed to Him the longest road? Clearly because it was something from which He shrank. On the one hand He seemed to be impelled towards it by the stream of events, which for Him was the will of the Father; on the other, He was repelled from it by an instinct of His own nature. If the purpose of death had been quite clear to Him, there would have been no room

for temptation ; He could not have hesitated for a moment where He saw without dubiety the Father's will. But, in the absence of perfect certainty, the repulsive aspect of death was allowed to have its sway, and the spirit of the Son of Man was in a strait betwixt two.

But, it may be asked, why was death so repulsive to Jesus? In this respect He differs from most teachers of the old world. The philosophies of the past had been distinguished by the little hold which death had over them. The Brahman longed for it ; the Platonist scorned it ; the Stoic despised it. Why should the purest of all the religions have been the most fearful? Why should the faith most full of God have been that which most palpably and most unblushingly shrank from the idea of death?

The answer is plain—just because it *was* the faith most full of God. To the Brahman, to the Platonist, in some sense even to the Stoic, the life of physical nature was a barrier to the life of the soul. To the first it was a delusion ; to the second it was an imprisonment ; to the third it was an incentive to feelings which ought to be overcome. But to the human soul of the Son of Man the life of physical nature was communion with the Divine Life. What others had called natural was to Him supernatural. The lily of the field, the bird of the air, the sower going forth to sow, the wind blowing where it listed, the mustard-seed expanding into ample branches, the fig-tree putting forth its leaves to tell that summer is nigh, were to Him, each and all, gleamings of the Life Divine — windows that opened in heaven to give a glimpse of God. Death was a shutting of these windows. To the mind of Jesus the physical world was a stream of the life of God. The sting of death lay not in itself, but in its idea. Death was to all men a loosing of the thread of nature ; to the Son of Man the thread of nature was one of those golden cords which bound the human spirit into communion with the Father.

This was His temptation—not a temptation to sin, but a temptation to live. He had a love of life which grew not out of His earthliness, but out of His very spirituality; had He been less full of God, He would have been less averse to die.

I am speaking, of course, of what is called the human soul of Jesus—of that in Him which, the Evangelist says, “grew in wisdom and knowledge.” It is only in this sphere that temptation is ever possible. Temptation always demands limitation, though it need not be a moral limit. We have the testimony of Jesus Himself for the statement that there was a sphere in His earthly nature and a time in His human life from which the knowledge of the future was veiled. Such veiling was essential to His sacrifice—is essential to any sacrifice. The clear foresight of a successful result would in all cases mar the sacrificial element. The sacrifice of Christ is mainly based on His death. It can only be so on the ground that death was to His human nature environed with similar clouds and encompassed with similar difficulties to those which burden the race of man. I say “similar.” There are clouds over death which are inseparable from sin. There are those who shrink from death because they think it will bring God nearer. Such a cloud Jesus could never have known. But, to shrink from death because it seemed to separate from God, to shrink from death because it appeared to break the thread of communion, this was a temptation which the purest might know, this was the temptation of the Son of Man.

And it is this temptation which, according to the writer to the Hebrews, gave Jesus the moral claim to the judgment of humanity. John himself in his Gospel does not hesitate to declare that Christ’s judicial authority rests, not on that in Him which is Divine, but on that which is human, “He hath given Him authority to execute judg-

ment because He is the Son of Man." The idea clearly is that His right to judge others rests morally on the fact of His own struggle—the struggle with the thought of death. It is a singular circumstance that His invitation to the labouring and heavy-laden is based by Himself upon His consciousness of human weakness: "I am meek and lowly in heart." He means that on the human side of His nature He has learned by the things He has suffered—learned the frailty of the frame of man. And, it is to my mind a circumstance no less remarkable that His assertion of human power is in exact proportion to His contact with human weakness, "all power is given unto Me in heaven and on earth; go ye therefore and teach all nations." When did Christ utter these words? It was after He had faced the great temptation and vanquished it. Why should all human power be given Him only after the conflict with death? Because "all power" means "all sympathy." In His dealings with man He acknowledges no power but the sympathetic. And, what is the root of universal sympathy? Is it not universal experience? If I would have sympathy with all nations, I must know experimentally the weakness with which all nations contend. Jesus emerges from the conflict with death wider in His human capabilities, stronger in His hold on man. He comes forth enriched by His poverty, enlarged by the struggle of His human nature, Judge of quick and dead because He has come into contact with the spirits in prison. He is able to promise rest to the labouring and the heavy-laden because He has known a kindred labour and felt an analogous ladenness. He has made the law of the Christian life the law of His own spirit: "I also have overcome, and am set down with My Father on His throne."

GEORGE MATHESON.

THREE NOTES ON THE GOSPEL ACCORDING
TO THE HEBREWS.

1. "Now it came to pass, when the Lord had come up from the water, the whole fount of the Holy Spirit came down and rested upon Him, and said to Him: My Son, in all the prophets was I waiting for Thee, that Thou mightest come and I might rest in Thee. For Thou art My Rest; Thou art My Son, (My) firstborn, which reignest for ever."

This passage is cited by S. Jerome in illustration of Isaiah xi. 1: "The Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon Him," etc. (Vall. vii. 156). The following parallels from the Psalms deserve to be noted in explanation of the words, "Thou art my Rest," etc.

Ps. cxxxii. 14: "This (is) My Rest for ever: here will I dwell, for I have desired it" (LXX.: *Αὕτη ἡ κατάπαυσις μου εἰς αἰῶνα αἰῶνος ὧδε κατοικήσω, ὅτι ἠρετισάμην αὐτήν*).

Ps. lxxxix. 27: "I also will make Him (My) firstborn" (LXX.: *Κἀγὼ πρωτότοκον θήσομαι αὐτόν*).

Ps. ii. 7: "Thou art My Son," etc. (LXX.: *Υἱός μου εἶ σύ, κ.τ.λ.*)

Thus the final words are an elaborate combination from three of the Messianic Psalms. But there seems no indication whether the combination was made in the first place in Hebrew from the Hebrew Psalter, or in Greek from the LXX. What interests us chiefly is the method by which the supposed Divine utterance is shaped.

2. "I will choose Me the excellent excellent: those whom My Father in heaven hath given Me."

This is cited twice in the *Theophania* of Eusebius (iv. 12), which survives only in a Syriac translation. The rendering of the Syriac has been a matter of dispute; and

aid of Greek MSS., a trace of this reading still lingers. For there we find: "they gathered the good good into vessels." Even the Peshito Syriac has a trace of it, though a different trace, in the word "chose." For it reads:

And they sat down (and) chose, and the good they put into vessels.

But how are we to account for the expression "the fishes that good good"?

It is not clear, to begin with, what is the meaning of the phrase. Two explanations are possible. One is that "the good good" is a Syriac idiom for "the best." The other, which is offered by those who deny the existence of such an idiom in Syriac, is that the sentence means: "They chose the good (as) good."

Whatever be the grammatical construction of the words "the good good," it is to be noticed that the second "good" appears as a substitute for "into vessels."

Now many Greek MSS. read for εἰς ἄγγη either εἰς ἀγγεῖα or εἰς ἀγγια; and Codex L actually has εἰς ἀγια, so that τα καλά εἰς ἀγια might be taken as "the good for holy ones," or "as holy." Another suggestion has been made to me on somewhat similar lines, namely; that εἰς ἀγγια got corrupted into εἰς ἀγαθα, which would yet more easily account for the rendering "the good (as) good." On the other hand, this departs more widely from the original Greek word.

In connection with the opposite view, which regards "the good good" as a superlative, we may note that Codex Bezae has at this point:

συνέλεξαν τα καλλιστα εἰς τα ἀγγια,
collegerunt meliora in vasis;

and Evan. 604 has συνέλεξαν τὰ κάλλιστα εἰς ἄγγη.

Moreover, the Old Latin gives some form of *optimus*, thus:

ek. collegerunt quae optuma (optimae *e*) sunt in vasa;
b. elegerunt¹ optimos pisces in vasis suis.

Now it is not necessary to suppose that the Old Latin *optima* represents a Greek reading *κάλλιστα*: for in Lc. viii. 8, where Codex Bezae has *τὴν ἀγαθὴν καὶ καλὴν γῆν*, we find in *cer* "bonam et optimam." *Optima* then may simply represent *καλά*, though here the actual existence of a Greek reading *κάλλιστα* seems to offer a more ready explanation.

With regard to *κάλλιστα* a solution presents itself, if we look again at the text of Codex Bezae: *συνελεξαν τα καλλιστα εις τα αγγια*, and consider the following possibility of confusion:

ΤΑΚΑΛΛΑΕΙΣΤΑΑΓΓΙΑ
 ΤΑΚΑΛΛΙΣΤΑΕΙΣΤΑΑΓΓΙΑ.

It is possible that this is the origin of the whole trouble. If *τα καλα εις τα* were read as *τα καλλιστα*, the word *αγγια*, or *αγγη* would give no sense, unless *εις τα* were repeated. Otherwise it might fall out, or become some equivalent of "fishes." In this case, if we can admit the superlative force of "the good good," the Old Syriac reading is entirely accounted for: and the Old Latin too, (as represented in *b*), where "the vessels" are restored again.

Whatever may be the true history and interpretation of these curious words, it is hard to resist the conviction that there is some link of connection between the words of the Gospel according to the Hebrews:

I will choose Me the excellent excellent,

and the words:

They chose the good good.

It is obvious that the Syriac words, which I have ren-

¹ *Elegerunt* is found elsewhere, and is the reading of the Vulgate.

dered as "excellent" and "good," are equally true representatives of the Greek *καλός*.

Other suggestions may be made to explain various points of detail on which I have touched; but I submit that there is a *primâ facie* case for the dependence of the Gospel according to the Hebrews at this point on the canonical Gospel according to S. Matthew. It certainly appears as though the writer of the former had based his phrase on a false reading and a false interpretation of the latter.

And, if this be so, we seem to see again the compiler's hand: for when once the second half of his phrase (viz., "those whom My Father in heaven hath given Me") is released from confusion with the first, it becomes more difficult to deny that it has come from the Gospel of S. John.

3. S. Jerome tells us that in the Gospel according to the Hebrews he read, not that the Vail of the Temple was rent, but that "a lintel of vast size" was "broken and divided," or "fell down" (Vall. i. 831 (cf. 53), vii. 236).¹

At the first of the places which I have referred to (*Ep. cxx. ad Hedibiam*), and at the last (*Comm. in Matth.*), he is commenting on Matthew xxvii. 50 ff. But at i. 53 (*Ep. xviii. ad Damasum*), he is expounding Isaiah vi. 1 ff.; so that it is well to refer also to iv. 93 (*Comm. in Isaiam*).

Now in Isaiah vi. 4, we read in the LXX.: "The lintel was removed by reason of the voice wherewith they cried" (*ἐπήρθη τὸ ὑπέρθυρον ἀπὸ τῆς φωνῆς ἧς ἐκέκραγον*). At i. 53 Jerome gives as the Latin of this, "elevatum est superliminare a voce qua clamabant."

Thus the removal of the lintel at the cry of the Seraphim is parallel with, and has apparently suggested, the fall of the lintel at the cry of the Lord (*κράξας φωνῆ μεγάλη*, Matt. xxvii. 50). But the original Hebrew of this passage

¹ Superliminare templi mirae magnitudinis corruisse, i. 831; superliminare templi infinitae magnitudinis fractum esse atque divisum, vii. 236.

in Isaiah does not appear to offer the same parallel. אַמּוֹת הַפְּסִים is rendered in the A.V. "the posts of the door," and in the R.V. "the foundations of the thresholds." S. Jerome himself renders the Hebrew by "superliminaria cardinum," perhaps under the influence of the earlier Latin version which he thus partially corrects.

It would appear then that, as in the case of the Voice at the Baptism the Old Testament was drawn upon for a substitute, so here too the Old Testament has offered a variation of the canonical narrative; but not, in this case at any rate, the Hebrew Old Testament, but its Greek translation by the Seventy.

I am indeed aware that Dr. Nestle has put forward in the EXPOSITOR of October, 1895, a theory of the relation between "the lintel" of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, and "the veil" of the Gospel according to S. Matthew. He says:

"The Greek καταπέτασμα corresponds, as every Hebrew scholar will know by heart, and a glance at any concordance proves, to a very common Hebrew word: פרכת, *prkt* (pronounced *paroket*); *superliminare*, again, stands for a rather rare word, spelt with the very same letters, but in a little different order: כפתר, *kptr* (pronounced *kaftor*). This Hebrew word stands in the Old Testament: Amos ix. 1; Zephaniah ii. 14."

I say nothing about the intrinsic probability of Dr. Nestle's conclusion: "Καταπέτασμα is translation of a misread כפתר, *superliminare*." My difficulty begins at an earlier point. I cannot find that *superliminare* is ever the equivalent in S. Jerome's Vulgate of כפתר. It is true that in each of the passages which Dr. Nestle quotes *superliminare* is found in the Latin, and כפתר is found in the Hebrew: but not so that the one word corresponds to the other. On the contrary, I find the following equations:

Amos ix. 1 : הכפתור = *cardinem*.

הספים = *superliminaria*.

Zeph. ii. 14 : בכפתריה = *in liminibus*.

בסף = *in superliminari*.

It is possible, of course, that Dr. Nestle, whose minute exactitude has laid many scholars under an obligation, has some further explanation to give of this matter; but it is also just possible, even in his case, that in rapid reading the eye has fallen upon the wrong words.

I fear that the above suggestions may arouse more than one sleeping lion of criticism. Dr. Harnack, in his remarkable book on the Chronology of Early Christian Literature, has accepted Dr. Zahn's verdict that the Gospel according to the Hebrews is in no way dependent on our canonical First Gospel; and has even expressed the hope that the condemned theory may never be heard of again.

I am not trying to state the case on behalf of this theory, or I should be bound to refer to older arguments in its favour. I merely ask whether these three fragments (alas! we have nothing but fragments) do not suggest (*a*) the hand of a careful compiler who knows his Old Testament well, (*b*) the use of the language of two of the Canonical Gospels, and (*c*) the introduction of an incident based on a Septuagint rendering. In each case there may be an alternative explanation which will prove better than mine. If there is not, then we must look again at our other fragments and search more keenly than ever for traces of their origin. The very fact that Dr. Harnack inclines to place this Gospel between 65 and 70 A.D. is sufficient to justify a new effort to penetrate its mystery.

J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON.

PAULINE CHRONOLOGY.

ON first reading Dr. Harnack's *Chronologie d. altchr. Litt.*, I. pp. 235 ff., I began for the moment to entertain a strong hope that the chronology of St. Paul's life is at last settled, that discussion and dispute must now come to an end, and that we may congratulate ourselves, not merely that they have ended, but also that the issue is to justify the chronology of Eusebius, so often disputed and despised, and to show that the fundamental authorities on whom our knowledge of early Christian history so largely rests have been in the right. Disputation and doubt and minute criticism would prove to have been most serviceable, if the issue is so satisfactory and so triumphant.¹

I may be allowed to speak so confidently, because his date is not the one which I have advocated, and therefore no one can say that I am a prejudiced witness. But the Eusebian date satisfies one test, which I regarded as fundamental, as well as the year which I selected; it makes one coincidence with Roman history more complete; and it is the recorded dating which embodied the results of the careful investigation of Julius Africanus, who had access to far better evidence than we possess (living at the beginning of the third century), and who was followed by Eusebius.

I learn from Mr. Vernon Bartlet that Prof. McGiffert of New York has advocated the same opinion; but at present I have not access to his paper. If it prove that he uses any of the arguments by which I shall attempt to test Prof. Harnack's position, the coincidence between us, being reached independently, will probably be taken by the readers as proving the truth of the arguments; and if he uses different reasons, this paper will supplement his.

¹ The first three paragraphs, written prematurely in support of Harnack, are left to show that I am not hostile to his view. As on careful consideration formerly, so now, I find the Eusebian dating inadmissible.

Eusebius dates the coming of Festus to govern Judæa in A.D. 56,¹ which implies that the last journey of Paul (in company with the delegates and offerings of the Churches of the Four Provinces, Acts xx., xxi.) was made in the days between Passover and Pentecost, A.D. 54, and that the voyage to Rome began in the autumn of 56. Hitherto A.D. 58 and 60 were the dates most favoured; while in my *St. Paul the Traveller* I advocated the dates 57 and 59. Let us now accept the earlier dates, and apply some tests which Prof. Harnack has not taken notice of.

In the EXPOSITOR, May, 1896, p. 338, I published a paper on the Pauline Chronology, in which it was proved (as I think conclusively) that of the years 56 to 59 A.D., none except 57 would suit the details mentioned in Acts xx. vv. 5-12. Briefly, the argument is this. Luke, in accordance with the general custom of the ancients, and especially of the Romans,² reckons always the first and the last items as units, even although they may not be complete. Now Paul's company started from Philippi for Troas as soon as the Days of Unleavened Bread were ended, and their journey to Troas lasted into the fifth day, and they stayed seven days in Troas. Further, either the last or the second last of the seven days in Troas was a Sunday, therefore we can reckon back and say with certainty that the eight days of the Jewish solemnity either lasted from a Wednesday to a Wednesday, or from a Thursday to a Thursday. But as, in years 56-59, the Passover never fell on a Wednesday, and only once (viz. 57) on a Thursday, it seemed to me to follow that the journey was made in 57, and on this I founded my whole chronology in my work on *St. Paul the Traveller*.

Now we know that the voyage from Troas onward began

¹ I do not take notice of minor differences, variations of MSS., etc. Every student knows how frequently errors of a year are made in such cases.

² An instructive example in Cicero *ad Att.* IX., 1, 1.

very early on Monday morning, obviously before sunrise. The one point of uncertainty in the argument is whether Monday was counted as one of the seven days. In other words, did Luke on the one hand reckon according to either the Roman Civil Day of twenty-four hours from midnight to midnight, or the Greek and Hebrew Sacred Day of twenty-four hours, from sunset to sunset,¹ or, on the other hand, did he count according to the common popular reckoning, which made the day begin from sunrise? This question could not be confidently answered, and both possibilities were open; but it did not vitally affect the subject, for apparently the only possibility left open for the years 56-59, was that Luke followed one or other of the first two methods. Accordingly I reckoned the part of Monday as the last of the seven days.

But I had the uneasy feeling that perhaps the language of Luke implied that he counted the Sunday as the last day spent in Troas, for the Sunday services with the incident rising out of them lasted till the sailing of the ship. Moreover, we know that on the Macedonian system even the Civil Day was reckoned from sunrise to sunrise,² and it is certain that this system prevailed widely on the Ægean coasts, and in such cities as Pergamos and Philippi. If that were the case, then Paul spent at Philippi the days Wednesday to Wednesday (14-21 Nisan), started on Thursday, and spent seven days, Monday to Sunday, in Troas. Now in A.D. 54 the Passover fell on Wednesday, April 10; so that, on this view, 54 is the only year which suits.

On the Eusebian chronology, then, we find ourselves

¹ On either of these methods of reckoning there would have elapsed a certain number of hours of the day following the Sunday, before the ship sailed.

² See my paper in *EXPOSITOR*, June, 1896, p. 457, on *The Sixth Hour*. On this system of reckoning, the day which followed Sunday would not begin until sunrise on Monday morning, and it is probable that the ship had already sailed before sunrise (*St. Paul*, pp. 290, 293).

compelled to hold that Luke reckoned his days (*i.e.* spaces of twenty-four hours), according to the Macedonian style,¹ from sunrise to sunrise, and that the seven days' stay at Troas began on Monday, and ended as the early north wind was beginning to blow on the next Monday morning (*St. Paul*, p. 293). But careful reading of Acts xx. always brings me ultimately to the view that, as the ship sailed on the day after Sunday, *v.* 7, the day of sailing was reckoned as one of the seven (on Luke's usual principle). Midnight is mentioned in *v.* 7 as if it closed the day. Let us, however, allow that both dates, 54 and 57, give permissible interpretations of Luke's words.

In estimating the bearing of these fixed dates on the earlier events of Paul's life, we may conveniently consider these events in two periods: (1) from the Apostolic Council onwards; (2) before the Apostolic Council. In the later period the dates given in my *St. Paul* must be set uniformly back three years; the Council is to be placed in the early spring of 47. As has been pointed out elsewhere, in a great number of cases we can be sure at what season of the year events occurred, and sometimes can date them even to a month or a day; but the years have hitherto always been uncertain. From the Council onwards, the sequence and intervals of the narrative are fairly certain; I can see no possibility of making any change in the relative chronology of the whole series of events from the Council onwards; and Harnack's reckoning of the lapse of time agrees exactly with mine (p. 237).

The dating advocated by Prof. Harnack (which I shall call the Eusebian dating, in order to be less personal) would entail no change of any consequence in the views advocated in my *St. Paul* even in the earlier period, and would support the view that the acquittal of Paul on the first trial

¹ This bears on the question of Luke's origin (see *St. Paul the Traveller* pp. 203, 206, etc.).

at the end of his two years' detention in Rome was due to the wider policy which Seneca's influence impressed on the Roman administration :¹ the reasons lie both in the facts of the period and in the tradition (in its details incorrect, but implying some historical germ of truth as its origin) as to the relation between the statesman and the missionary. The earlier date is even more favourable to this view than the later. Seneca's fall was not finally consummated till 62 (some months after Paul's acquittal, according to my former dating); but his ignoble conduct in 59 in condoning and justifying the murder of Nero's mother, Agrippina, and other crimes of the emperor, had possibly weakened his influence as much as they must have sapped his own self-reliance and moral power.

The proconsulship of Gallio causes some difficulty. According to the Eusebian dating, Paul was in Corinth from September, 48, to March, 50. Gallio arrived after Paul had been some time in Corinth; and, as his official residence would begin in summer, he must have come to the city about May or June A.D. 49. Now it is assumed in my *St. Paul* (and by many previous writers) that Gallio's career was entirely stopped during the exile of his younger brother Seneca. In that case, as Seneca was recalled only in 49, Gallio's proconsulship could not begin earlier than A.D. 50 (probably in May), which is too late. But it is not absolutely impossible that Gallio's career continued in spite of the misfortunes of his brother, and that he enjoyed office even during the period of Seneca's exile.² The Eusebian dating is therefore not barred absolutely by this consideration.

¹ The generous freedom with which all religious questions seem to have been treated in the earlier years of Nero's reign was probably due to Seneca's influence: *St. Paul*, p. 355.

² He was in Rome when Seneca wrote from exile consoling his mother Helvia (xviii. 1), and did not lose his rank; but he was certainly not a *grata persona* at court, and his career would be at least more difficult.

But a more serious difficulty remains. Gallio had been adopted, and changed his name before he went to Achaia. Now Seneca addressed the treatise *On Anger* to his brother under his original name Novatus; so that when that treatise was written, the adoption had not taken place. But Lehmann¹ has given strong reasons for the view that that treatise was written after Seneca returned to Rome in A.D. 49; and his view is endorsed by one of the highest authorities on the subject, the fifth edition of Teuffel's *History of Roman Literature*, edited by Dr. Schwabe.² If the date of the treatise were certain, this argument would be conclusive against the Eusebian dating.

Further, as must be acknowledged, there is a certain improbability that Novatus should have been adopted while Seneca was in disgrace and the family under a cloud. The adoption was a mere form by which Novatus might succeed to the wealth of the elder Gallio; and every one who thinks of the state of Roman society, and the extraordinary prevalence of *hereditæ*, and the way in which even the highest sought after the succession to the property of rich *orbi* and *orbæ*, must feel how improbable it is that under the corrupt and greedy Messalina any one would be bold enough to adopt the brother of the man whom she hated. It is therefore probable that the adoption would not take place earlier than A.D. 49, too late for the newly adopted son to go as governor to Achaia in that year.

Some mistakes commonly made about Gallio, even in good authorities, may be noted here, as they are apt to

¹ *Claudius und seine Zeit*, pp. 315 ff. I have deliberated carefully over the arguments there advanced, at first with a prejudice against them (for sometimes Lehmann, perhaps, lays too much stress on a merely general statement made by Seneca in an indefinite way *exempli gratia*); but, as a whole, their force is sufficient to make a very strong case (though not absolutely conclusive), for Lehmann's dating. Diepenbrock, *Seneca*, is not convinced by Lehmann: he leaves the date open.

² I have only the English translation, not the German text; but the translation is acknowledged to be good and thoroughly representative.

distort the force of the arguments: (1) It is an error to suppose that he must have been consul before his proconsulship of Achaia, for the latter office would naturally follow after his prætorship; (2) it is incorrect to place Seneca's prætorship in 49, for he was only recalled from exile in that year, and was rewarded with the prætorship, *i.e.* nomination for the following year 50.

The facts with regard to Gallio, though not favourable to the Eusebian dating, are capable of being explained away. But the following argument seems conclusive.

When Paul was arrested, the Sicarii were familiar to every one, and the insurrection of "that Egyptian" was passed (*Acts* xxi. 38). The "Egyptian" had disappeared, but his reappearance was looked for by the people, and was regarded as possible, or even probable, by the Romans. Now the Sicarii did not arise till the reign of Nero, and Nero began to reign on the 13th October, A.D. 54.¹ The feasts, when Jerusalem was crowded with visitors, were the occasions of their exploits; and their first act was the murder of the ex-high-priest Jonathan. The earliest possible date for this event, therefore, was the Passover of 55. After the murder, evidently at some one of the later feasts, the "Egyptian" appeared. Yet, on the Eusebian dating, Paul was arrested at Pentecost A.D. 54, under the reign of Claudius.² It seems strange that Prof. Harnack has not observed this difficulty.³ I should be glad to learn how he would dispose of it. At present it seems to me that we must choose between Eusebius and Josephus; and I am confident that every one who is used to historical criticism

¹ Josephus, *Bell. Jud.*, ii. 13, says that they arose after the brigands were put down by Felix; and he places the destruction of the brigands under Nero. See also *Jud. Antiq.*, xx. 8.

² Lewin discusses the date very completely, and brings down the rising of the "Egyptian" as late as 53: I should prefer 56 or 57.

³ It is all the more strange, as he expressly says, that all these events happened under Nero, p. 236, lines 1-3. Jerome puts them under Claudius.

must feel that Josephus is a much higher authority. The method of arranging events in a brief chronological table presented peculiar difficulties in ancient times, owing not only to the immense variety of eras, of ways of expressing dates by annual magistrates' names, by years of kings and emperors, *etc.*, but also to the variation in the beginning of years (sometimes during the spring, sometimes at the autumn equinox, sometimes the first of January, *etc.*). Every historical student knows by experience how difficult it is even now to reduce a date by some ancient era to the proper year of our chronology: volumes by the score have been spent on this task, and many controversies, which are still raging, turn on this difficulty. Every student knows also how many mistakes of this kind exist in Jerome's Latin version of Eusebius's Chronicle (and the additions), as well as in the Armenian version. Moreover, MSS. of such a chronicle are peculiarly liable to errors of misplacement. If we have to choose between Josephus and Eusebius, we must follow Josephus; but I shall be very glad to learn any way of reconciling them.

An example may be added from Orosius, whose account of the reign of Claudius is very good, of the tendency to error in chronological statements. He dates the accession of Claudius in A.U.C. 795 (A.D. 42) instead of A.U.C. 794, and this error makes him date the famine at Rome (which really occurred A.D. 51)¹ in the tenth year of Claudius (whereas it was in the eleventh), the riot at the Passover under Cumanus (probably A.D. 48)² in the seventh year of Claudius (whereas it was in the eighth), the famine at Jerusalem (A.D. 45)³ in the fourth year of Claudius (whereas it was in the fifth).

¹ Tacitus, *Annals*, xii. 43; *St. Paul the Trav.*, p. 68.

² Schürer, *Gesch. des Jud. Volkes*, i. p. 475, and Lewin, *Fasti Sacri*, p. 290, date Cumanus's arrival at Jerusalem in 48, which would imply that the riot occurred in 49.

³ *St. Paul the Trav.*, pp. 51 ff.

Accordingly we must interpret on the same analogy his statement about the edict of Claudius expelling the Jews from Rome. He places it in the ninth year of Claudius; but we must follow his reckoning, and understand A.D. 50. But, according to the Eusebian dating, Paul came to Corinth A.D. 48 and found there the fugitives expelled from Rome by that edict; hence Orosius is, on any interpretation, as hostile to the Eusebian dating as Josephus seems to be,¹ but his authority is, of course, far from so great as that of the Jewish historian.

Finally, I may claim the pleasure of finding myself in agreement with Dr. Schürer, who has discussed the Eusebian dating in his *Geschichte des Jüd. Volkes*, I. pp. 483 ff., and rejected it, briefly but emphatically, as irreconcilable with Pauline chronology. He does not give much argument, evidently considering the case too plain. Prof. Harnack has apparently made the mistake of assuming that, because Schürer had mentioned no other reasons, there were no others to give; otherwise it is difficult to see how he could have passed over the serious difficulty connected with the Sicarii, who belong to the period of the final struggle against Rome.

A counter-argument in favour of the Eusebian dating must be considered. Josephus says that Felix, when he returned to Rome, was saved from serious punishment by the influence of his brother Pallas. Now Pallas was disgraced in the beginning of the year 55²; and hence a desire is felt to set back the return of Felix to Rome earlier than that event. Holtzmann places the recall of Felix in 55, in order to make him arrive in Rome before the fall of Pallas

¹ Harnack quotes Orosius as agreeing with his reckoning; but seemingly he has made a mistake in counting. He sees that Paul must have arrived at Corinth in A.D. 48, and yet he reckons Orosius' date (which, even uncorrected, implies that Aquila was in Rome in 49) to be a proof that Aquila had come to Corinth before autumn 48.

² Some time before the birthday of Britannicus on February 12.

from power ; but how could the recall be sent out by Nero after he entered on power October 13th, A.D. 54, in time for Felix to reach Rome before February, 55? Such a journey could not be accomplished in the winter season within the space allowed. It is therefore impossible that Felix could have arrived before Pallas fell ; and the argument derived from Josephus's emphatic words about Pallas's influence shielding his brother ceases to have any force. Dr. Harnack suggests that Tacitus made an error in regard to the birthday of Britannicus, which fell on 12th February, later than Pallas's disgrace ; and suggests that we should understand the 15th, not the 14th birthday, bringing down the disgrace of Pallas to A.D. 56. But he forgets that this would not be a sufficient correction of Tacitus, for the event is also dated by the consuls of the year and by the whole arrangement of the narrative. Dr. Harnack's suggestion is one which he can only have made in haste, and which he himself is not likely seriously to entertain after a little reflection : certainly no one who approaches these questions from the side of Roman history will entertain it for a moment.

But Pallas lived many years after his fall from power, and was the richest man in Rome. A millionaire is a great power even in the best state of society that has ever been attained : how much more so in the corrupt, legacy-hunting age of Nero ! Josephus's words are a little too emphatically expressed, but the fact they contain is true ; Pallas's power shielded Pallas's brother from his just punishment. As soon as it became patent to the world that Pallas was to be permitted to retain his life and his wealth, his influence would return in some measure. His fall would for the moment destroy his power and frighten every one from his side ; but the period of his greatest weakness would last only during the first months after his disgrace.

Finally, it rouses astonishment that Dr. Harnack, defending Eusebius's date in a matter like a change of procurators, rejects it for the martyrdom of Paul, an event which Eusebius would regard as of infinitely greater importance. Harnack treats it as one of the few certainties in early Christian chronology that Paul was executed in 64, but if the day, 29th June, is rightly given by tradition, no years are open under Nero except 65-67.¹

W. M. RAMSAY.

CHRISTIAN PERFECTION.

III.

THE TEACHING OF WESLEY.

IN former papers we have seen that, according to the teaching of various New Testament writers, Christ claims from all who put faith in Him unreserved devotion to His service, a devotion involving victory over all sin; that all this is wrought in them by the Holy Spirit, through faith, and in proportion to their faith; and that this faith is a confident expectation, based on the promise of God, that from this moment He will work in us whatever He requires from us. We also saw that this whole-hearted devotion is practically identical with the maturity or perfection which Christ and His Apostles set before those to whom they spoke and wrote.

A doctrine called by him *Christian Perfection* or *Entire Sanctification* was a conspicuous element of the teaching of Wesley. The effect of that teaching is seen in the great impulse given by the Methodist revival to the spiritual life

¹ The fire was 19-24 July; the persecution of Christians began later. Paul's trial lasted several months, see *St. Paul*, p. 361; he was probably arrested abroad in the second stage of Nero's action (*Church in R.E.*, p. 241); his previous acquittal barred arrest (*St. Paul*, p. 308), until that stage.

of the Anglo-Saxon race. This marvellous result claims for this teaching, and for this conspicuous element of it, special attention.

Wesley's teaching, more perhaps than that of any other great religious leader, was an outflow of his own spiritual life. To him theology and religion were practically identical. And no other writer has thrown open to inspection his own spiritual life as Wesley has done. In his published *Journal* and other works we see his sincerity and earnestness, his all-pervading seriousness, his eager search for truth in things divine, the clouds which at one time gathered round him, various external influences which moulded his thought and life, and the sudden transition from deep gloom into the full light of the favour of God.

A marked crisis took place on Wednesday, 24th May, 1738, which he thus describes: "In the evening I went very unwillingly to a society in Aldersgate Street, where one was reading Luther's preface to the Epistle to the Romans. About a quarter before nine, while he was describing the change which God works in the heart through Christ, I felt my heart strangely warmed. I felt I did trust in Christ, Christ alone, for salvation: and an assurance was given me that He had taken away my sins, even mine, and saved me from the law of sin and death. . . . And herein I found the difference between this and my former state chiefly consisted. I was striving, yea fighting with all my might under the law, as well as under grace. But then I was sometimes, if not often, conquered; now I was always conqueror." This happy and sudden experience was preceded by long and earnest spiritual effort, by diligent study of the Bible, and by helpful intercourse with good men. All this is fully described in the work just quoted. Evidently this inward experience resulted from a spiritual apprehension of St. Paul's great doctrine of Justification through Faith.

This doctrine thus apprehended armed Wesley with power to proclaim to others the salvation he had himself experienced. After a three months' visit to Germany and to the Moravian settlement at Herrnhut, he began the life-long evangelistic activity which has done so much to breathe life into English Christianity. Of the day after his arrival in England, he writes, "I began again to declare in my own country the glad tidings of salvation, preaching three times, and afterwards expounding the Holy Scripture, to a large company in the Minories. . . . The next day I went to the condemned felons in Newgate, and offered them free salvation." His *Journal* affords complete proof that the Methodist movement was born in the little gathering in Aldersgate Street, and in the heart of Wesley.

Alongside the experience described above, we note another spiritual development, which began at an earlier period and before the commencement of the *Journal*. An account of it is given in a treatise by Wesley, entitled, *A Plain Account of Christian Perfection*. He writes: "In the year 1725, being the twenty-third year of my age, I met with Bishop Taylor's 'Rule and Exercises of Holy Living and Dying.' . . . Instantly I resolved to dedicate all my life to God, all my thoughts, and words, and actions; being thoroughly convinced there was no medium; but that every part of my life (not some only) must either be a sacrifice to God, or myself, that is in effect to the devil." In A.D. 1733, more than five years before he found assurance of pardon of sins, he preached a sermon, still extant, on *The Circumcision of the Heart*, in which he correctly describes the ideal life portrayed in the New Testament. This sermon he quotes in the treatise before us. "In this is perfection, and glory, and happiness: the royal law of heaven and earth is this, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and

with all thy strength.' Other sacrifices from us He would not, but the living sacrifice of the heart hath He chosen. Let it be continually offered up to God through Christ in flames of holy love. And let no creature be suffered to share with Him; for He is a jealous God. His throne will He not divide with another; He will reign without a rival."

The rest of the treatise consists of abundant quotations from various writings of Wesley, from hymns published by him, from conversations at his conferences with his helpers, and from the religious experience of various persons; which prove conclusively that throughout his whole course Wesley taught the same doctrine of Christian Perfection. At the conclusion of the treatise he sums up by saying, "In one view it is purity of intention, dedicating all the life to God. It is the giving God all our heart; it is one desire and design ruling all our tempers. It is the devoting, not a part, but all, our soul, body, and substance to God. In another view, it is all the mind which was in Christ, enabling us to walk as Christ walked. It is the circumcision of the heart from all filthiness, all inward as well as outward pollution. It is a renewal of the heart in the whole image of God, the full likeness of Him that created it. In yet another, it is the loving God with all our heart, and our neighbour as ourselves. Now take it in which of these views you please, and this is the whole and sole perfection, as a train of writings prove to a demonstration, which I have believed and taught for these forty years, from the year 1725 to the year 1765."

Wesley raises the question whether this experience is instantaneous or gradual. In proof that it is sometimes instantaneous, he appeals to cases known to him; but says that in other cases it was so gradual that the possessor "did not perceive the instant when it was wrought." But he assumes that in all cases, whether perceived or not, it was

actually instantaneous. He also teaches that it is obtained by faith.

A much more concise, and clear, and complete account of Christian Perfection, and an admirable summary of the distinctive elements of Wesley's teaching, are found in his sermon (No. 43) on *The Scripture Way of Salvation*, in the sixth volume of his published works. He describes salvation as including Justification, which he says is another word for pardon, and the New Birth, and Sanctification which begins in the moment of justification and gradually develops into "entire sanctification," which is a "full salvation from all our sins." This last he calls "perfection," which, he says, is "love excluding sin; love filling the heart, taking up the whole capacity of the soul."

He teaches that faith is the one condition both of justification and sanctification. "Everyone that believes is sanctified, whatever else he has or has not. In other words, no man is sanctified till he believes: every man when he believes is sanctified." He adds that, as for justification repentance also is necessary, so there must be a sort of repentance consequent on justification and preceding sanctification: and with great clearness he harmonises this teaching with the statement that faith is its one condition. He then asks, "But what is that faith whereby we are sanctified, saved from sin, and perfected in love?" This question he answers by saying that "it is a divine evidence and conviction, first, that God hath promised it in the Holy Scripture . . . secondly, that what God hath promised, He is able to perform . . . thirdly, that He is able to do it now . . . one thing more, a divine evidence and conviction that He doeth it. In that hour it is done: God says to the inmost soul, 'According to thy faith be it unto thee!' Then is the soul pure from every spot of sin: it is clean from all unrighteousness."

The above teaching seems to me to be in the main in

close accord with that of the New Testament. Wesley has done valuable service by calling attention to the distinction between justification, which is a change of relation between God and man, and on the other hand the new birth and sanctification, which are inward changes; and to the indissoluble connection between the relative and the inward change. He guarded from immoral abuse his doctrine of justification, by teaching again and again that any fancied pardon of sins which is not followed by increasing victory over sin is worthless. He also did great service by teaching that God claims from all His servants the unreserved devotion of all their powers, possessions, time, opportunities, *i.e.* of all they are and have, for the advancement of His Kingdom. This doctrine, he appropriately calls "Entire Sanctification." It is the sanctification of the entire man. A correlative doctrine is that whatever God claims from us He is ready to work in us by His infinite power, through the agency of the Holy Spirit. A third correlative doctrine is that this divine inworking is conditioned only by faith, that He is ready here and now to work, in all who accept His promise so to do, this full salvation. These doctrines have been held in all ages by the greatest and holiest teachers of all Churches. But no one has put them before the English people, of all classes, so fully and so forcibly as Wesley has done. This teaching did much to create the Evangelical revival of the last century, and its influence is felt to-day in the whole religious life of the English people.

Wesley's teaching that this full salvation is sometimes gradual and at other times instantaneous, or rather that it is always instantaneous but that sometimes we are unconscious of it, need cause no difficulty. For, in reference both to justification and sanctification, faith is in some cases instantaneous, in others gradual. And the conditional blessing must vary with the condition. Sometimes

the way of salvation is put before a man, after long search possibly, for the first time clearly and fully: and in a never-to-be-forgotten moment he embraces the promise and lays hold of the blessing promised. Such was the moment in which Wesley himself, while listening to the words of Luther read, passed into the full light of the pardoning grace of God. In other cases, the surrender of faith is gradual; and the light and power of the new life are gradual also. There may also be successive crises, as fresh elements of Gospel truth are successively grasped and appropriated.

We need not object to Wesley's teaching that there is a sort of repentance following justification and preceding entire sanctification. Naturally we think of sin first as involving penalty; and from this penalty we seek escape by pardon. This we obtain by accepting the Gospel pardon for all who believe. This Gospel of forgiveness is a revelation of God, and of the infinite love manifested in the death of Christ. In the light of this revelation we see the evil of sin as never before. We become conscious of inward defilement and bondage, and we cry earnestly for deliverance. Surely this may be described as a higher or deeper kind of repentance. And without it we can no more accept the promise of full salvation than at an earlier stage we could accept the promise of pardon without an earnest resolve to forsake sin. This clearly-stated and valuable parallel, we owe to Wesley.

Some will repudiate Wesley's strong preference for a conscious and sudden transition to full salvation. "It is infinitely desirable, were it the will of God, that it should be done instantaneously; that the Lord should destroy sin 'by the breath of His mouth' in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye. And so He generally does; a plain fact of which there is evidence enough to satisfy any unprejudiced person." For this last statement, Wesley had

no sufficient ground. He judged simply from the cases which came under his own observation. But his own day and his own surroundings were exceptional. When, after long spiritual torpor, a free and full salvation is first preached, we may expect many cases of sudden illumination. But as Christian teaching spreads and is taught from childhood onwards and the young are trained in the light of the Gospel, sudden transitions will become more rare. Moreover, a spiritual crisis in the past is a most unsafe ground for present faith and hope. Whatever we have done or experienced in the past, God promises us to-day the fulness of the new life in Christ. This promise, not our past experience, is the rock on which we stand securely.

Probably Wesley's preference for instantaneous salvation was prompted by his own experience. This reminds us that the more closely theological teaching bears on spiritual life the more liable it is to be moulded and warped by subjective influences.

Wesley teaches that this full salvation may be lost. This implies that it is conditioned by continuance in faith. But he admits that for twenty years after he found peace with God he was "not thoroughly convinced of this." This admission reveals the gradual development of Wesley's thought on the great subject before us. And that for long years he did not know that full salvation might be lost, reveals the unchanging constancy of his own faith and loyalty to Christ. He teaches also that "it is constantly preceded and followed by a gradual work." It was, to him, not a resting-point attained, but a starting-point for fresh progress.

In one important point which has recently been matter of dispute, Wesley's teaching was indefinite and incomplete. He teaches frequently that they who put faith in Christ are saved from evil thoughts; and he explains

clearly what thoughts are evil. He argues that, since their hearts are no longer evil, evil thoughts cannot proceed from them. This suggests that there are in them no evil tendencies, and that temptation can come to them only from without. This teaching needs to be carefully guarded.

Every sinful act or thought tends to form a sinful habit of action or thought; and these habits, which are the accumulated force of all our past sins, are a hostile power in us to-day, drawing, or sometimes apparently forcing, us along the path we have trodden in the past. In not a few cases, sinful tendencies are evidently inherited from ancestors. And the whole race inherits from its first father moral bondage. These habits and tendencies are in many cases closely connected with the bodily form received from our ancestors and from Adam. Their force is sometimes almost irresistible. Yet without complete victory over them we cannot give to God the devotion He claims. Of these evil tendencies, the appetite for intoxicating drink is a good example. It is embedded in the drunkard's bodily and mental and moral constitution; and in some cases is inherited from others. It is driving him to ruin.

What salvation does the Gospel offer in this case? It will rescue the drunkard completely from the otherwise irresistible and terrible power of the habit which he has formed by repeated indulgence in excessive drinking. Christ will give him by His own mighty power working in him through the Holy Spirit complete victory day by day over his besetting sin; and he who was once a helpless sot will become henceforth a strictly sober man. If so, he is saved fully, and cleansed, from his sin.

But I venture to suggest that even in this case, however complete his faith in Christ and his abhorrence of his own sin, the reformed drunkard will or may be still conscious of his old habit as a present hostile force, a force which his

own unaided power cannot overcome. But, if he abide in faith, he will be daily conscious of a Hand from above overcoming this hostile power within. And each day's victory will weaken the old habit of intemperance and go to form a habit of sobriety. The old habit is a present peril; and demands constant watchfulness. But he who puts faith in Christ knows that in this conflict he does not stand alone: and his life is a song of thanks to Him who gives the victory. Thus does Jesus save us from our sins.

My reason for the above suggestion is that in the case supposed the promises of the Gospel are already fulfilled. For temptation, even though it be from within as a result of previous indulgence in sin, does not defile or weaken until yielded to. Consequently the promise to cleanse from all sin does not necessarily involve annihilation of all inward tendencies towards sin. They are conquerors over sin who have complete victory over each temptation as it arises. So long as they abide in faith, the cross of Christ stands as an impassable barrier between them and sin. In this sense, while still striving against it, they are dead to sin.

For the above teaching, I cannot claim definitely the authority of Wesley. But, so far as I know, he has not written anything which contradicts it. This aspect of the subject lay apparently outside his mental horizon. In the presence of his unswerving loyalty to God and simple faith, temptation to known sin seems to have had little or no power. And this somewhat unfitted him to analyse the temptations which to weaker natures are so real and so dangerous.

We must guard against two errors. On the one hand, we may claim here and now full deliverance from all stain or bondage of sin: but on the other hand we cannot gain at once by faith the position we should have had if neither we nor our first father had ever sinned. From some of

Wesley's remarks we might infer that in those who put full faith in Christ the curse of original sin is removed. This was not his real meaning. Carefully taken as a whole, his teaching, so far as it goes, is good and most valuable. But each part of it must be read in the light of the whole. Others seem to teach that while life lasts our victory over sin can be only partial. But Paul bids us reckon ourselves to be dead to sin in Christ. Unless by faith we are completely saved from sin, this reckoning would be incorrect. And John teaches that the blood of Jesus cleanses from all sin.

Wesley appeals, in proof of his teaching, to certain persons who professed to enjoy this full salvation. Such appeals must be received with extreme caution. Those who have witnessed the lives of saintly Christians will listen with respect to whatever they say about their inward experience. But such experience is seldom a secure basis for broad theological inferences. Wesley describes as very unsatisfactory some who in his day professed to enjoy perfect love.

One more criticism. The words *perfect* and *perfection* and the term *perfect love* as used by Wesley seem to me inappropriate. They do not correctly reproduce in English the meaning of the Greek original. No one would speak, as the Greeks did, of a full-grown man as *perfect*. The words *mature* or *full-grown* are much better equivalents. Moreover, if we use the term *perfection*, it must be carefully guarded. And it is a great drawback to any term that, unless carefully guarded, it is liable to serious misunderstanding. The best terms for describing Wesley's doctrine are Full Salvation, or Entire Sanctification, or better still, Sanctification through Faith.

It is very remarkable that in the chronological account given in the treatise on *Christian Perfection* Wesley does not refer, even while quoting a conversation three months

later, to the great crisis of May, 1738. For this omission I can give no satisfactory explanation, except possibly lapse of time.

From the above will appear how great is the debt of all English-speaking churches to the teaching of Wesley. We need not wonder that here and there it is open to trifling criticism. His treatise on *Christian Perfection* bears witness to the immaturity of his own thought. For he does not hesitate to correct some of his earlier statements, and he admits, in one important point, the development of his own opinion. Amid his ceaseless activity he had no time to give to his teaching scientific precision. And what he left incomplete no one has been found to complete. His doctrine of Entire Sanctification remains now as he left it. We have good devotional books of a desultory kind. But we greatly need a scientific exposition, an offspring of the mature and consecrated thought of the age in which we live, of the great salvation which Christ purchased for us by His death and left as a legacy to His Church.

JOSEPH AGAR BEET.

THE PROLOGUE TO THE GOSPEL OF JOHN.

It is one of the accepted results of New Testament interpretation that the Gospel of John is constructed on a somewhat elaborate plan. Commentators have for the most part regarded the first eighteen verses as an introduction, the design of which is to set forth the Gospel in miniature. There is however diversity of judgment as to the lines on which the Gospel develops, a common opinion being that it displays the progress of faith and unbelief, the former strengthening into assured victory, while the obstinacy of the latter grows more tragic as the story of the life of Jesus advances. If this be the main theme of the Gospel, there is

justification for the fashion in vogue at present, which regards the prologue as a tripartite prelude in ever-widening circles with the *motifs* of the drama to follow.

This pretty unanimous opinion of scholars whose theological positions are utterly divergent from one another has been disputed by Harnack. He finds a different atmosphere in the prologue from that by which the Gospel figures are surrounded. The latter is mainly Jewish. The first eighteen verses are Hellenic, and serve to introduce the Jewish narrative of the Palestinian Messiah to those Greek readers who had their home in Asia Minor.

None of the ordinary interpretations appears to be entirely satisfactory, so that we are at liberty to attempt a more adequate explanation.

The author of the Gospel has told us in chapter xx. that he had quite a definite object in writing his Gospel, and it is antecedently probable that the plan of the work is so arranged as to place the subject in the light that will most clearly produce the result at which the author aims. In accordance with this, I hope to show that a true reading of the prologue will prove that its purpose is best seen when it is read in the light of John xx. 31, and that its leading conceptions occur in the body of the Gospel.

We are told in xx. 30, 31, that the record of Christ's life is to set forth events which are *σημεῖα* of the nature of the Person. His life was a continual display of these *σημεῖα*, but such a selection has been made as to throw the real nature of this Person into relief, that men may be persuaded that Jesus who lived on earth was the Jewish Messiah, the Son of God. A belief of this kind is no mere historical certainty nor an intellectual conviction. The full name, the Christ, the Son of God, has in it a marvellous dynamic; for the name is a true description of the Person; and if you can believe in the name of Jesus the Christ, the Son of God, you have life. The object of the Gospel then is

to unfold to men what was wrapped up in that Man Jesus. His whole human being in all its activity instinct with the life of the Messiah, the Son of God, is recognised by the believer because it is a *σημείον*, an expression of divinity. If Jesus is depicted, belief and life will ensue. The author does not purpose primarily to describe the course of faith and unbelief. These are secondary results. His aim is to show forth the fulness of the life of Christ, to explain its inner meaning, to prove that the God of being and history was revealed in the Galilean Jesus. Heaven and earth have met. Of necessity it follows that those who are receptive believe and live, but the objective portraiture is independent, at least largely so, of the faith of those among whom He lived.

Further, the writer justifies these stupendous assertions from his own experience. He has received life from his personal contact with Jesus. His discovery of the meaning of that life brought him life, and he believes that by his faithful testimony to facts others will have a like blessed experience.

These thoughts are found in the prologue. Prominent in it is the witness of personal testimony. "The Word tabernacled in our midst, and we beheld His glory . . . from its fulness have we all received." We recognised the divine attributes of grace and truth because their completeness brought grace and truth into our own souls. Now for the first time we have had a full revelation of the nature of God. Not that it came to us entirely as a surprise, for we had been long looking for a theophany. The Old Testament spoke of man as the image of God, of a Messiah; and we who knew the highest that it could give have found a higher. It was because we read the past aright that we understood the present revelation.

If the assumption that has been made is correct, the prologue should be found to develop in accordance with

xx. 31, through three manifestations of the life of the same Person—the Son of God, the Messiah, Jesus. It is to be observed that the order of progress in the prologue is the reverse of that in xx. 31, the reason for which is obvious. Assuming that the prologue enunciates the principles of the history, the author naturally proceeds from the more general statements and the eternal conditions to the concrete realization ; while in the Gospel, which is a history, the process of the life of Jesus makes manifest a character so full of grace and truth—that He must be the Christ, and therefore of even more august lineage—the Son of God.

To proceed to a more detailed examination of these verses. As has often been remarked, the Gospel opens with a word that is assumed to be well known. John is writing for eager readers. His age was one in which the wise were becoming wearied out with the attempt to bring heaven and earth together. The great dualism of life they had sought to solve by the method of philosophy, and in the system-building which was rife the term *λόγος* was significant to the men of those times. To the Greek it meant much, embodying what was most precious and ideal in the result of his mental struggle. To the Jew it meant more, for it was to him the living word of God. In the word of the prophet thrilling with a life not his own, spoke that mystic soul which is elsewhere called wisdom, God's architect for the world and their own history. The word *Logos* thus summarizes two worlds of thought. Strange to say, its ambiguous meaning gives the answer to the earnest attempts made by two national spirits to solve the problem of existence. God is infinite, said the Greek. He is purest thought, of essence so subtle that He is utterly remote from matter, and His habitation is the realm of ideas. Yet our world is manifestly an expression of reason, so much so that one school of thinkers found the immanence of God a more rational belief than barren transcendence. The world

displays the active reason of God, who is its soul. The latest, and in a way the highest, attempt of philosophy to unite the two truths of the transcendence and immanence of the Deity, finds its ablest exponent in Philo. It must however be confessed that Philo's attempt was a failure, for his Logos is a bundle of contradictions. Unintelligible as the conception was, it was widespread. Every earnest thinker of the East, whose problems, brought in to him along lines of commerce between brilliant provincial capitals, grew commonplace as they travelled, knew what was meant by the term. It was the symbol of squaring the circle of intellectual thoughts, from which attempts some were soon to seek satisfaction in the revelations of Neoplatonism.

But the Jew also had faced the same riddle of life, though from another side. God was for him the great inscrutable Person, the Holy One, whose name even cannot be uttered. And yet the world of mortal men cannot stand alone. "As the hart panteth after the waterbrooks, so panteth my soul after Thee," is the cry of Israel. How can Jehovah come near enough to satisfy? Israel's problem was religious as the Greek's was metaphysical. The former seeks to bring two persons together—the latter to form a synthesis of pure thought. Accordingly revelation is the religious possession of Israel; and down through its history, in angel, prophet, servant of the Lord, Wisdom, Messiah, Memra, the religious need of personal speech from God is more or less adequately satisfied. Speech through human mediators, speech in the life of the servant Israel, speech in the objectified wisdom of God in creation, speech in the Messiah to come—all this and more was signified for the Jew by the term *ὁ λόγος*. The author of this Gospel was acquainted with both these efforts of thought, and it was necessary for him to define the sense in which he took the term. "In the beginning was *ὁ λόγος*." Every reader is arrested at once. By the choice of this word at the commencement of his

Gospel, he means his readers to understand that he is girding himself to the task of all tasks. What deliverance has the aged apostle to give on this supreme question?

His answer is at once a manifesto. The Greek world has attempted the impossible. No solution can be given in terms of metaphysics. John casts aside the attempt of Philo as hopeless. Thought is baffled, for abstract reasoning is too narrow to compass the full-orbed life of this world of love and hate. But where pure thought failed, life in a Person succeeded. What man could not reason out, the Son of God in His love spoke. Accordingly John, a Jew of the Jews, follows in the lead of his nation's effort and success, telling his readers that the riddle of all existence can be solved only by religion; in this agreeing fundamentally with another Jew, who wrote, "God, who in time past gave a partial and varied revelation through the prophets, hath in this new Dispensation spoken by (His) Son."

The term *Logos* is architectonic for the whole prologue. As the cathedral contains within itself, and gives shape to, nave, transept, and inner shrine, where the worshipper adores before the altar, so in the life of the *Logos* there are three manifestations, whose harmonious unity reveals the complete glory of His nature. After the eternal pre-existence of the *Logos* has been set forth, He is shown to be the Messiah of Israel, and the third event in His career, the Incarnation, forms the climax of this opening section.

A more detailed examination will establish this statement. Verses 1-4 describe the nature and function of the *Logos* as *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ*. John's conception of the *Logos* as a pre-existent Person, in communion with, and therefore of like nature with, God, is contained in the first verse. As though to emphasize what he regards as most important in the first verse, he repeats his opening words

as to "the mysterious league of union absolute," from which source of eternal love all being springs. There was no primeval, unresolvable chaos to baffle the forth-putting of this generous activity. Love had so far met no obstacle (*v.* 4). As life flowed forth in abundance,¹ the love hidden within its volume burst out into the higher life of man, who had light of mind and heart to know and return the love that brought him forth—

"Thus God dwells in all,
From life's minute beginnings, up at last
To man—the consummation of this scheme
Of being, the completion of this sphere
Of Life."

These verses are John's ontology. All creation is the expression of the loving nature of God, and is the handiwork of His Assessor. Life and love, not pure thought or abstract ideas, are the archetypes of existence. Not crushing Fate, nor the imperious movement of an unconscious eternal order, nor a weltering ocean of chaos, whose dark bosom is the storm-driven home of failure, sin, and the mystery of human life—none of these have anything to do with creation. The Logos whom men seek is declared to them to be a Divine Being who lives.

In all this there is little or no direct Hellenic influence. The fundamental thought is Hebraic, tempered, however, defined, reduced to greater precision by current Greek conceptions as to creation. The Logos is not Reason, but a Person. Creation is not the self-production of the thought of God, but the expression of His loving will. The Logos is supreme, with no eternal cosmic foe. Man is not the unconscious outcome of a *λόγος σπερματικός*, the immanent life of creation.

All existence starts from, and is summed up in, a self-

¹ I take the marginal reading of Westcott and Hort.

conscious Being, and the circle is not complete till life, becoming light, issues in the intelligence of man, who can think and know and love. Such truth would not be utterly strange to the pious Jew, who understood the spirit of his own scriptures.

So far John has told us that the light of man is to be traced to the active life of this pre-existent Being. Nature and history throb with an invisible life, and light breaks through from an eternal fountain. Having thus described the Logos as the Son of God, it would have been possible to omit the section 5-13, and to pass on to *v.* 14, which begins a new moment in the history of the Son of God.

This verse states the supreme fact in revelation round which the whole movement of the prologue turns, and we are now in a position to give a clearer analysis of the development.

It would be premature for *v.* 14 to follow immediately on *v.* 4. We ask why there was an Incarnation. And further, was this the first revelation in history of the life of the Logos? To these two questions we get the answers given, the first in *v.* 5, and the second in *vv.* 6-13, which are also dependent on *v.* 5. *V.* 5 contains the ultimate reason, not only of the Incarnation, but also of the Messianic career of the Son of God. In *vv.* 6-13 the author states the true conception that the Son of God is also the Messiah of Israel, together with the cause of His rejection by His own people. Finally, the proof and the results of *14a* follow in *14b-18*.

In *v.* 5 we are told that, ever since the life of creation brought forth man with his moral nature, the light of man, which comes from the Logos, has been surrounded with the immoral element of darkness. Light, darkness, truth, falsehood, moral activity, sin, have been opposed, and the victory which is to be given to the one, which so understands the other as to snatch away his secret (*καταλαβείν*),

has been long undecided. Light shineth in darkness, therefore the true light must come to dispel the darkness. There has been much light in Israel where the Shekinah of God dwelt, but the full glory of the Father was not seen till the only-begotten Son revealed it.

The second main section of the prologue begins at the sixth verse with the appearance of John, a messenger from God. We may observe in passing that at the commencement of each of the three sections there is a reference to some manifestation in the history of the Logos; first, His eternal condition, then the culmination of Messianic preparation, and finally the full incarnate appearance.

The reason for beginning *v.* 6 with the public ministry of John is to be found in the fact that with him the Messianic period of Israel's national history closed. He, as the last and greatest of the prophets, was to usher in the new Dispensation. Witness-bearing was his function, and the Person whose approach he heralds is none other than the Son of God, the Messiah of His people. But there are two things to be explained, the fact of John's failure to receive recognition from the leaders of his people, and, even more, the kindred fact of the rejection of the Messiah Himself, whom John proclaimed. The writer has this in mind from *vv.* 9-13. If the Life of the world and the Light of men was the Messiah of Israel, the immanent unseen life of the Logos making Israel what it was, the theocracy should have been the home (*τὰ ἴδια*) of the Son of God, and it was not an unreasonable expectation that John the Forerunner, who was in thorough sympathy with the Light, should have so stirred up the latent faith of his people that they would be willing to receive the Messiah when He came. How, then, account for His rejection? Unquestionably in Paul's time, and in that of the other apostles, presumably even in the later life of the Apostle John, the rejection of the Messiah by His people was one

of the great difficulties in the way of the Gospel. Hence there is a whole world of apologetic concealed in this Gospel, and there is only one answer to all objectors.

The nature of the Messiah accounts for His rejection. He was the Messiah because the Son of God. If that is the case, recognition of Him does not depend on natural birth or fleshly privileges, but on that moral sympathy which comes from God, and gives a man the right to be called a son of God. The Jews were sons of God in name only. They lacked faith, or the moral condition that made it possible for them to believe on the name of Jesus and become sons of God. Hence the tragedy in the life of the Son of God, the passionate bitterness of those who were once the people of God, but are now "the Jews"; the joyous confidence of feeble strangers in a world ruled by the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of the flesh—all this is accounted for in *v.* 13.

Attention should be directed to the three expressions of *v.* 13, which are Hebraic, being used to contrast the ordinary Pharisaic with the spiritual conception of sonship. At the time when John wrote another aristocracy was beginning to put forth claims for its adherents, intellectual, however, rather than national, based on the possession of natural pneumatic endowment. This materialistic intellectual claim of Gnosticism must have been known to John, as we gather from his epistles; and yet the fact that he uses no terms descriptive of it in this verse seems to prove that he has here no direct thought of Hellenic readers, but that this section is Jewish and is intended to meet the difficulties of Jewish readers with regard to their Messiah.¹

To substantiate this interpretation of *vv.* 5-13, it may be observed how fittingly they serve as an introduction to the

¹ Whatever Jewish elements there were in Gnosticism, it drew largely on Greek thought.

main history of the Gospel. It opens with the proclamation of the Messiah to the world by John. Nicodemus puts forward the very objection that is answered in *v.* 13, and the various discourses and discussions with the Jews in the first twelve chapters present the same difficulty as their leading motive.

The third section of the prologue is the consummation of the history of the Logos, which is given in the solemn announcement of the Incarnation in *v.* 14. While it is indeed true that the fact itself has been anticipated in *v.* 11, it was, however, given in a connection so different as not to interfere with the progress of the thought. There we had the bare mention of the historic event without any addition being made to the history of redemption. It was apologetic, and in place when speaking of the Messianic character of the Logos. It was given as a part of the philosophy of the history of Israel. His advent illustrated the method of God's revelation to Israel, and explained that as a whole the history of the nation was a failure, because it misinterpreted its Messianic hope.

Beginning with the 14th verse, we have the Incarnate life of the Messiah, the Son of God, witnessed to by personal experience. This is in exact accord with what we should expect from *xx.* 30, 31. The believing eyewitness has found the life of Jesus to be his life, and expects to be able to communicate his faith by presenting a life of Jesus so full of grace and truth as to belong only to One who is unique, the only begotten Son of God. John and his fellow believers had been seeking for truth. Jews and Greeks, who had long been scanning the horizon for new revelations, had almost lost their moral enthusiasm in the quest for a wisdom that eluded them, as the city of the sun in the west sinks with its glory and leaves the mariner to night and the stars. But now truth has appeared, not in the abstract, but in a life. Truth, harmony, love, are at the

basis of all being, for the Man Jesus shows the glory of the Father full of grace and truth. Jesus, the only-begotten, proves to me that the world was created in love. His grace and truth were with a fulness so overwhelming, so inexhaustible, as to have come only from the glory of the eternal Father. Such a life as that of Jesus must be cosmic, universal. All the broken lights of the past, the glimmering constellations of Israel's night, or her bright particular star of morning, or streaks in the orient that presaged the coming day—these, the light and hope of Israel to men, were fulfilled by being lost as the dawn of His glory broke in upon the world. John, the forerunner, knew the secret of Israel, and he sent his disciples to the Lamb of God, and now the apostolic band can testify that Jesus has more than satisfied all that they as true Israelites had looked for. No believer who had had a life under the law could dream of exchanging the grace and truth of Jesus the Messiah for the rigour of Moses again. As is brought out afterwards in *vv.* 37-47 the true Israelite recognises that Moses wrote of Jesus, and the law which was given points to the full life of grace.

Verse 18 sums up the whole prologue. The word *Logos* has been dropped, having served its purpose when it arrested attention. The problem has been solved by substituting for it the new term "Son" or "God." (The variant readings make no real difference in the sense.) *Logos* was too remote. God, the unseen, is revealed in the Man Jesus, who as the Son is of the essence of God, who possesses the highest nature that mortal men know. He is a Father full of grace and truth. Thus the final word on religion has been spoken.

At the close of the Gospel in *xx.* 28, Thomas really brings the history to a conclusion with the profoundest confession given in its course, and one that harmonizes with the last verse of the prologue. Overcome with the gracious con-

descension of Jesus, he exclaims in adoration, My Lord and my God.

If the foregoing interpretation is correct, it will be seen that the prologue is neither designed particularly for Greek readers, nor can it be regarded as an addition by a later hand to accommodate the Gospel to a new environment. Its nerve and tissue are those of the body of the Gospel. Its connections are too subtle, its harmony too delicate, its spirit too indefinitely similar, to be the work of another than the author of the Gospel.

R. A. FALCONER.

SOME RECENT OLD TESTAMENT LITERATURE.

THE ability and learning of the first volume of Prof. McCurdy's book on the Monuments and Semitic History whetted the appetites of Bible students for the rest of the work. The importance of the second volume¹ is even greater than had been expected. It was stated in the first volume that a second would complete the work. The author had intended to devote a single chapter to a very brief sketch of the governmental, social, and moral progress of the Hebrew people. But the importance of this branch of his subject grew upon him, and he was led to treat it on a much larger scale, so that 236 pages—more than half the present volume—are occupied with the "Inner Development of Israel." Hence there is to be a third volume, which will deal with the period after the Fall of Nineveh, and include an account of the development of ancient Hebrew literature. Obviously any notice of the second

¹ *History, Prophecy, and the Monuments*, by J. F. McCurdy, Ph.D., LL.D., Professor of Oriental Languages in University College, Toronto, vol. ii., to the Fall of Nineveh. New York: The Macmillan Company. London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., pp. xxi., 443. 14s. net.

volume by itself must be incomplete ; justice can only be done to the earlier part of the work when the whole has been published. We cannot properly understand the author's account of the history of Israel until he gives us the promised statement of his views as to the literature. Even in this volume he sometimes anticipates the next. We gather, for instance, that he regards Isaiah xix. 18-25 as the work of Isaiah, § 656 ; and in § 606 he tells us that Psalms i.-lxxii. " must as a whole belong to . . . the golden days of prophecy, the period reaching from Elijah to Micah."

The first half of the volume covers a very wide range ; an account of the " Inner Development of Israel " involves a sketch of its political history, both internal and external, and also a somewhat comprehensive treatment of Hebrew archæology. There are chapters on " Elements and Character of Hebrew Society," and on " Society, Morals and Religion." Even 236 pages are very few for so large a theme. Hence the treatment is necessarily concise. Much is only given in outline, and in this first half of the volume Prof. McCurdy merely states results without discussion and often without quoting authorities. The statement, § 394, that " we are now to occupy a few paragraphs with an inquiry into the usage of the leading social and domestic terms of Hebrew literature," rather takes our breath away. Actually we get results rather than an inquiry, but the sentence quoted illustrates the scale of the work. But an account on such a scale of the history of Israel as reconstructed in the light of recent literary criticism is one of the pressing needs of our time ; and we are grateful to Prof. McCurdy for his very valuable contribution to the work. We need not say that it is scholarly and judicious. We have not space to discuss details, and we can scarcely consider the general conception of the history till the author's views on the literature are before us. But we may say that Prof.

McCurdy holds that, while accepting critical principles and results, the Bible story of the earlier experiences of Israel contain much more substantial history than is admitted by Wellhausen and Stade. He regards, § 445, the Patriarchs, "Abraham and his descendants" as "the heads of the leading families in their respective clans"; he accepts the sojourn in Egypt and the invasion of Canaan by united Israel from the east of Jordan.

The second half of the volume traces the relations of the Jewish monarchy to Egypt and Assyria, and also the history of Assyria, from the fall of Samaria to the fall of Nineveh. The chief authorities are the Assyrian monuments and the Old Testament, but use is also made of Herodotus, Josephus, and other Greek literature. In many cases, inscriptions are given in full. Elsewhere, too, we are not asked to rely upon the author's bare *ipse dixit*, but are furnished with chapter and verse, so that the student may verify statements for himself. Moreover one pleasant feature of this book is the absence of the *odium theologicum*. Prof. McCurdy's narrative is all the more interesting that it is constructed, not upon apologetic, but upon historical principles. It is as readable and edifying as it is instructive; and illustrates the fact that the scientific history of religion is the best vindication of the faith.

The two recent volumes¹ of the *Cambridge Bible* are by Dr. Davidson and by his former pupil Dr. Skinner. We need not say that such names on the title-pages of "Nahum, Habakkuk and Zephaniah," and of "Isaiah i.-xxxix." are a guarantee for extensive and exact scholarship, and for careful and accurate treatment. Dr. David-

¹ *The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges*. General Editor for the Old Testament: A. F. Kirkpatrick, D.D. *Nahum, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah*, by the Rev. A. B. Davidson, LL.D., D.D., Professor of Hebrew, Edinburgh, pp. 144. 3s. *Isaiah, Chapters I.-XXXIX.*, by the Rev. J. Skinner, D.D., Professor of Old Testament Exegesis in the Presbyterian College, London, pp. lxxix., 295. 4s. Cambridge, at the University Press, 1896.

son's Introductions to the three prophets are packed with information. In reading them, one is amused to remember that the Cambridge Bible originally only professed to be "for schools" and added "colleges" as an after-thought. Many paragraphs are more suited for the *Zeitschrift für Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* than for a school textbook. For the most part Dr. Davidson is content to expound the doubts as to the integrity of these books without pronouncing an opinion; but he seems inclined to retain as much as possible, if not everything, for the prophet whose names are placed at the heads of the books. Of the Psalm in Habakkuk iii., he says, p. 58, "The question whether chapter iii. belong to the prophecy of Habakkuk, or be an independent poem, cannot be answered with certainty." We should like to quote two or three sentences from p. 62 because they help to explain why many, even amongst younger scholars, hesitate to accept some recent developments of criticism. "If the date of Habakkuk had to be fixed from the circle of his ideas alone, he might be assigned to the end of the exile or later. The instance shows how precarious it is to draw inferences as to the date of a passage or a writing solely from the ideas it contains. The literature is far too scanty to enable us to trace the course of religious thought and language with any such certainty as to fix the dates at which particular ideas or expressions arose."

Dr. Skinner also deals very fully with the introduction. He recognises that the extant book of Isaiah is the result of editorial processes, which we can only imperfectly trace, and finds no literary evidence of the complete book before the beginning of the second century, B.C. The results of analysis, what is probably Isaiah's—*e.g.*, the Messianic passages ii. 2-4, iv. 2-6, ix. 1-7, xi. 1-9; and what is probably not—*e.g.*, xii., xiii.-xiv. 23, xxi., xxiv.-xxvii., xxxiii.-xxxix.—are definitely stated; and there is a very

useful table of the probable order of the Isaiah prophecies. There is a clear and interesting account of the life and times of Isaiah, fully illustrated from the inscriptions. In his discussion of the prophet's teaching, Dr. Skinner declares that "Isaiah is a monotheist in the strictest sense of the term." This volume treats a difficult and important subject with great success.

Mr. Woods' *Hope of Israel*¹ consists substantially of the Warburtonian Lectures delivered in Lincoln's Inn Chapel in the years 1890-4, and is reprinted from the *Expository Times*. Frankly accepting the methods and conclusions of modern criticism, it discusses the effect of these upon our understanding of Hebrew prophecy, especially as a preparation for Christ and Christianity. The author's line of thought and results are not largely different to those familiar to students of recent Old Testament theology, but his work has a distinct place of its own, and we trust it will be widely read by all classes of Bible students. *The Hope of Israel* is a delightful book, and presents a rare combination of spiritual fervour and intellectual candour.

*Practical Reflections on the Minor Prophets*² consists of the text of the Authorised Version, with brief expositions attached to each verse or paragraph. The exposition applies the principles of the text to the circumstances of modern Christians by means of a very elastic paraphrase. It is a book which may be useful for devotional purposes and furnish suggestions for the pulpit. The preface, by the Bishop of Lincoln, tells us that Dr. Liddon highly commended similar works by the same author. It is a misfortune that the bishop should think fit to cite the

¹ *The Hope of Israel, a Review of the Argument from Prophecy*, by F. H. Woods, B.D., sometime Fellow and Theological Lecturer of St. John's College, Oxford, Vicar of Chalfont St. Peter, Edinburgh. T. & T. Clark, 1896, pp. viii., 218. 3s. 6d.

² *Practical Reflections on every verse of the Minor Prophets*, by a Clergyman. Longmans, Green & Co., London, 1896, pp. xxvii., 212. 4s. 6d.

Wesleyans to illustrate "the evil" of "the reaction" from "the fear of 'enthusiasm,'" because there has been amongst them an "undisciplined development of the feelings and affections."

Prof. Ryle's sermon on Genesis i.¹ is an eloquent and suggestive discourse on the lines of his *Early Narrative of Genesis*, but the price is prohibitive.

We are glad to see that the earlier volumes of the *Modern Reader's Bible* have been sufficiently successful to encourage Prof. Moulton to issue *Genesis, Exodus, Deuteronomy, Judges, Job*, a volume containing *Solomon's Song, Ruth, Esther*, and *Tobit*, and another containing *Ecclesiastes* and the *Wisdom of Solomon*.²

The last volume³ of the *Little Books on Religion* is "Why be a Christian," by Dr. Marcus Dods: it includes a study of the character and experience of David, and has a practical rather than an evidential value; a useful book to place in the hands of a boy verging towards a young man.

Another work indirectly connected with the Old Testament is Mr. Schechter's *Studies in Judaism*.⁴ They consist of Essays and Reviews, reprinted from the *Jewish Quarterly* and the *Jewish Chronicle*. They deal with various interesting topics of Jewish life and literature, Jewish dogmas and tradition, Jewish teaching as to the child and woman, titles of Jewish books, the Hebrew collection in the British Museum. There are also accounts of the Chassidim, a Jewish sect founded in the eighteenth century, and of certain Jewish teachers, Nachman Kroch-

¹ *Physical Science and the First Chapter of Genesis*, a sermon by H. E. Ryle, D.D. London: Macmillan & Co., 1896, pp. xvii. 1s. net.

² Macmillan & Co., 2s. 6d. a volume.

³ *Little Books on Religion*, edited by W. Robertson Nicoll, LL.D. *Why be a Christian*, addresses to young men by Marcus Dods, D.D. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1896, pp. 140. 1s. 6d.

⁴ *Studies in Judaism*, by S. Schechter, M.A., Reader of Talmudic in the University of Cambridge. London: H. & C. Black, 1896, pp. xxx., 442. 7s. 6d.

mal, born 1785; Elijah Wilna, born 1720; and Nachmanides, born 1195. In an essay on *The Law and Recent Criticism*, Mr. Schechter maintains that criticism will not derogate from the authority of the law. There are notes and index, and the book will provide information for the studious and amusement for those who care to explore the byways of literature. The author, though apparently neither Professor nor Doctor, may be said to stand in the succession of Hillel and Gamaliel.

W. H. BENNETT.

ST. JOHN'S "LAST HOUR."

(1 JOHN II. 18-27.)

THE Apostle John is an old man; he has lived through a long day. The way of the Lord that he teaches is by this time a well-marked path, trodden by the feet already of two generations. Amongst his "little children" he counts many grey-headed "fathers" in Christ, who "have known Him that is from the beginning." In his lifetime, and since the hour when he heard the elder John say on the banks of Jordan, "Behold the Lamb of God!" centuries seem to have passed; the cumulative effect of ages—what the Gentile Apostle called "the ends of the world"—has been accomplished and a thousand years transacted in one day.

Though new in seeming, and surpassing all that heart of man conceived, there is nothing that is sudden and hasty, nothing of raw or rash invention, nothing fugitive or tentative in the things of which St. John writes. These teachings are as old as they are new (*vv.* 7, 8); they belong to the universal and divine order; they reveal and impart "the eternal life, which was with the Father," and is lodged in His bosom beyond the range of time. Swiftly laid, the foundation of the apostles is no less surely laid. While "the world is passing away and the lust thereof," while it trembles and rocks as in the throes of a moral dissolution, while threatenings from without and apostasies within their ranks frighten infirm and dubious believers, those who do not "*know* that they have eternal life," the note sounded by this Epistle is that of serene assurance, of

absolute stability attaching to the apostolic witness concerning Jesus Christ. The veteran leader, whose eye has long watched and his voice guided the battle, proclaims the victory already won. "Our faith" has proved the temper of its weapons upon the world's stoutest armour. Its "young men have overcome the wicked one"; its martyrs "have overcome him because of the blood of the Lamb, and because of the word of their testimony." The Christian brotherhood has shown itself to possess "an unction" which "teaches it about all things," and holds it safe from poisonous error. In Ephesus, for example, faulty as the Church there was, it has "tried them which call themselves apostles, and they are not," and has "found them false" (Rev. ii. 2, 3, 6). Whatever trials yet remain, whatever conflicts are preparing for the kingdom of God in that strange future which John read in the isle of Patmos through the mirror of prophecy as in a riddle, the faith that he and his companions have delivered to the saints is secure in the keeping of the Spirit of truth. It has no foes to meet more dangerous than those already foiled and beaten.

Time has vindicated the bold inference that the aged Apostle drew from his experience. The disciples of Jesus "have known the truth, which abideth in us and shall be with us for ever." The apostolic era was a rehearsal of the Church's entire history; and the New Testament, in which that era condensed itself, contains all the principles and forces that are needed to subjugate the world to Jesus Christ. St. John has but one thing to say to his successors: "Abide in Him." The allurements of the heathen world which his converts had once loved (*vv.* 15-17), and the seductions of false prophets arising amongst themselves (*v.* 26), are alike powerless to move those who build upon this rock. They have chosen the good part, and it will not be taken from them.

As for the recent seceders from the apostolic communion, their departure is a gain and not a loss; for that is manifest in them which was before concealed (vv. 18, 19). They bore the name of Christ falsely: *antichrist* is their proper title; and that there are "many" such, who stand threateningly arrayed against His servants, only proves that His word is doing its sifting and judicial work, that the divine life within the body of Christ is casting off dead limbs and foreign elements, that the truth is accomplishing its destined result, that the age has come to its ripeness and its crisis: "whence we perceive that it is the last hour."

We may best expound the paragraph under review by considering in order the crisis to which the Apostle refers, the danger which he denounces, and the safeguards on which he relies—in other words, *the last hour*, *the many antichrists*, and *the chrism from the Holy One*.

1. "My children, it is the last hour—we perceive that it is the last hour." Bishop Westcott, in his rich and learned Commentary on this Epistle, calls our attention to the absence of the Greek article: "*A last hour* it is (ἐσχάτη ὥρα ἐστίν)"—so the Apostle literally puts it; and the anarthrous combination is peculiar here. (St. Paul's, "*A day of the Lord* is coming," in 1 Thessalonians v. 2, resembles the expression.) The phrase "seems to mark the general character of the period, and not its specific relation to 'the end.' It was a period of critical change." *The hour* is a term repeatedly used in the Gospel of John for the crisis of the earthly course of Jesus, the supreme epoch of His death and return to the Father. This guides us to St. John's meaning here. He is looking backward, not forward, and speaking the language of memory more than of prophecy. The "last hour" is the last of a succession of hours, the end of some day that is expiring. The venerable Apostle stands upon the border of the first Christian age. He is nearing the horizon, the rim and outmost verge of that

great "day of the Lord" which began with the birth of the first John, the forerunner, and would terminate with his own departure: himself the solitary survivor of the twelve Apostles of the Lamb. The shadows were closing upon John; everything was altered about him. The world he knew had passed or was passing quite away. Jerusalem had fallen; he had seen in vision the overthrow of mighty Rome, and the Empire was shaken with rumours and fears of change. The work of revelation, he felt, was all but complete. Those deadly opposers of the truth had risen, who were foretold in the words of Jesus, and in the teachings of Paul so well remembered at Ephesus; the Satanic apostasy within the Church, foreboding the last judgment, had reared its head. The finished truth of the revelation of the Father in the Son was now confronted by the consummate lie of heresy which denied them both (v. 22).

A last hour it certainly was; and it might be (who could tell?) the last hour of all. The Master had said concerning John, "If I will that he tarry till I come!" Many deemed this to signify that the beloved disciple would live on earth until the Lord's return in glory. He relates the incident in the appendix to his Gospel (ch. xxi.), without giving his own opinion for or against this notion; he only states the exact words of Jesus, and intimates that so much was never promised. But this saying might well excite the desire for such a favour. And why was John kept waiting for so long, when all the rest had been summoned away?

It may seem strange to us that the inspired apostles should have known almost nothing of the duration of future history; but even from Himself, in the days of His flesh, our Lord confesses that this knowledge was veiled: "Of that day or hour knoweth no man, not even the angels in heaven, *nor the Son*, but the Father only." Christ left His disciples in all matters of the times and seasons, and leaves them still, to wish and hope but not to *know*. And so the

wise Apostle writes humbly, and with guarded caution, keeping the hour of the advent an open question. He was not permitted to see into the next century. He presided over the completion of the grand creative age, and he saw that its end was come. Clearly it was *his* last hour; and for aught he knew it might be the world's last, the sun of time setting to rise no more, the crash of doom breaking upon his dying ears.

The world passes through great cycles, each of which has its last hour anticipating the absolute conclusion. The year, with its course from spring to winter, from winter to autumn, the day from dawn to dark, image the total course of time. You have watched the sun set on a still summer evening, yielding yourself to the influences of the hour—the light slowly waning and the shadows creeping stealthily from their ambush upon you, the colours dying out of earth and sky, the sounds of life ceasing one by one, the chill night wind striking on your cheek and whispering amongst the trees the riddle of fate that no man reads—and you have had the strange sense that all was over! a foretaste of life's and the world's last hour; you came away doubting if that sun will rise again! The great epochs and "days" of human history have a similar finality. Each of these periods in turn sensibly anticipates the end of all things. The world is seen sweeping in its orbit towards the gulf, and grazes the edge to escape it for that time, and to set forth upon a wider circuit which must bring it to the final plunge. Like the moth wheeling about the taper's flame and flitting by with singed wings to fall at last consumed, like some huge creature of heavy flight powerless to soar to the mark of its desire, but that circles in ascending spires, passing its goal many times till it lands spent upon the summit—such appears to be the destined course of the world towards judgment. Many great and notable days of the Lord there have been, and perhaps will be, many last

hours before the last of all. The earth is a mausoleum of dead worlds; in its grave-mounds, tier above tier, extinct civilizations lie orderly interred. Eschatology, like everything else in Scripture, has its laws of development—"the blade, the ear, and the full corn in the ear." Each "day" of history, with its last hour, is a moment in that "age of the ages" which includes the measureless circumference of time.

2. The Apostle John saw the proof of the end of the age in the appearance of *many antichrists*. He could not say that "the Antichrist" had come whom the Church looked for to herald the second coming of the Lord Jesus; but "even now" there were many who deserved this name, and their appearance was the signal of a crisis which, for aught one could say, might be the prelude of the final scene of judgment.

The word "antichrist" has, by etymology, a double meaning. The Antichrist of whose coming St. John's readers had "heard," if identical, as one presumes, with the awful figure of 2 Thessalonians ii., is a rival or mock-Christ, a Satanic caricature of the Lord Jesus; the "many antichrists" were not that, but deniers, indeed destroyers of Christ; and this the epithet may equally well signify. So there is no real disagreement in the matter between St. Paul and St. John. The heretic oppugners of Christ, starting up before John's eyes in the Asian Churches, were forerunners, whether at a greater or less distance, of the supreme antagonist, messengers who prepared his way. They were of the same breed and likeness, and set forth principles that find in him their full impersonation.

These antichrists of St. John's last hour, the opponents then most to be dreaded by the Church, were teachers of false doctrine. They "deny that Jesus is the Christ" (v. 22). This denial is other than that which the same words had denoted fifty years before. It is not the denial

of Jewish unbelief, a refusal to accept Jesus of Nazareth as the Messiah; it is the denial of Gnostic error, the refusal to admit the Divine Sonship of Jesus and the revelation of the Godhead in manhood through His person. Such a refusal makes the knowledge of both impossible; neither is God understood as Father, nor Jesus Christ as Son, by these misbelievers. To "confess" or "deny the Son" is in effect to "hold" or "not to hold" the Father (v. 23). The man who in this way "denies the Father and the Son," he is "the antichrist" and "the liar" (v. 22). His denial negatives the central truth of Christianity, as St. John conceives it; it dissolves the bond which gives unity and force to the entire new covenant, and nullifies the Gospel absolutely. The nature of the person of Christ, in St. John's view, is not a question of transcendental dogma or theological speculation; in it lies the vital point of an experimental and working Christian belief. "Who is he," the Apostle cries, "that overcometh the world, except he that believes that Jesus is the Son of God?" (v. 5); and again, "Every one that believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is begotten of God" (v. 1). The saving and the conquering faith is that which beholds in the man of Nazareth and Calvary the Son of God seated at the right hand of power.

The traditions of the rise of heresy point to the attempts made about this time, and especially in St. John's province of Asia, to divide Jesus Christ (whose Messianic title had now become His proper name) into the human *Jesus* on the one hand, son of Joseph and Mary, mortal and imperfect as other men; and *the Christ*, a Divine æon or emanation, that descended upon Jesus, and was associated with Him from His baptism till the moment of His death, when He cried, "Why hast Thou forsaken Me?" This was, evidently, to make of Jesus Christ *two* beings, to break up His Divine-human person, as the disciples had known Him, into

shadowy and discrepant fragments. Those who taught this denied that "Jesus is the Son of God." They denied "Jesus Christ come in flesh" (iv. 2, 3); they renounced the Incarnation, and thereby abandoned the basis laid in Christianity for fellowship between God and man, and closed the way of access to the Father given us in the Son of His love.

This error, which beset the Church for generations, and has deeply affected its development, grew from the philosophical notion of the incompatibility of the finite and infinite, or, in other words, the absolute separation of God from the world. With this axiom were involved the postulates of the illusive nature of phenomena and the intrinsic evil of matter—assumptions that implicate in their fatal coil every truth of religion, both doctrinal and practical, and that struck at the root of apostolic faith. To St. John's mind, there was no lie to compare with this. Those who brought such maxims with them into the Church could never have been Christians: Christ Jesus the Lord was, from the outset, to them a non-reality; the critique of their philosophy dissolved the facts about Him into a play of the senses, a Docetic spectacle. The manifestation of the Divine in Jesus, upon this theory, was a train of symbols, grander and fairer it might be than others, a shadow still of the heavenly things and not their "very image," a parable of ideal truth that each man must unriddle as he could. To maintain this was to take away all certainty from the Gospel, and all fellowship from the Church. Never could we arrive, starting from such premisses, at "the unity of the faith and the knowledge of the Son of God."

In passing from St. Paul's chief Epistles to this of St. John, the doctrinal conflict is carried back from the atonement to the incarnation, from the work to the nature of Christ, from Calvary to Bethlehem. There it culminates.

Truth could reach no higher than the affirmation, error could proceed no further than the contradiction, of the completed doctrine of the Person of Christ as it was taught by St. John. The final teaching of Divine revelation is daringly denied. The Apostle justly specifies this as the conclusive issue. For Christ is all and in all to His own system. "What think ye of the Christ?—what do you make of *Me*?" is His crucial question to every age. The two answers—that of the world with its false prophets and seducers (ii. 19; iv. 5), and that of the Christian brotherhood, one with its Divine Head—are now delivered in categorical assertion and negation. Faith and unfaith have each said their last word. The manifestation of God the Father in His Son has come to its close, and called into play the antagonisms with which it has to deal. Subsequent debates of Christ with Antichrist will be only the repetition and unfolding, the application upon an ever enlarging scale, of what is contained, and in principle settled and disposed of, by the word of the Apostles of the Lord, and within the pages of the New Testament.

3. While the Apostle John insists on the radical nature of the assaults made in his last days upon the Church's Christological belief, he points with entire confidence to *the safeguards* by which that belief is guaranteed.

(1) In the first place, "*you*,—in contrast with the anti-christs, none of whom were really 'of us' (v. 19)—you have a chrism from the Holy One (*i.e.* Christ); all of you know" the truth and can discern its verity (vv. 20, 21). Again, in v. 27, "The chrism that you received from Him abides in you, and you have no need that any one be teaching you. But as His chrism teaches you about all things, and is true, and is no lie, and as it did teach you, abide in Him." *Chrism* is Greek for anointing, as *Christ* for anointed; St. John's argument lies in this verbal connexion. The chrism makes *Christians*, and is wanting to

anti-Christs. It is the constitutive vital element common to Christ and His people, pervading members and Head alike.

We soon perceive wherein this chrism consists. What the Apostle says of the chrism here he says of *the Spirit* afterwards in chapter v. 7: "It is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is the truth." And in chapter iv. 6 he contrasts the influences working in apostolic and heretical circles respectively as "*the spirit* of truth" and "of error." The bestowal of the Spirit on Jesus of Nazareth is described under the figure of *unction* by St. Peter in Acts x. 38, who tells "How God anointed (*christened*) Him—made Him officially the Christ—with the Holy Spirit and power."¹ It was the possession, without limit, of "the Spirit of truth" which gave to the words of Christ their unlimited authority: "He whom God sent speaketh the words of God, for He giveth Him not the Spirit by measure" (John iii. 34, 35). Now out of that Holy Spirit which He possessed infinitely in His Divine fashion, and which His presence and teaching continually breathed, the Holy One gave to His disciples; and all members of His body receive, according to their capacity, "the Spirit of truth, which the world cannot receive," but "whom" He "sends" unto His own "from the Father" (John xiv. 17; xv. 26, etc.). The Spirit of the Head is the vital principle of the Church, resident in every limb, and by its universal inhabitation and operation constituting the Body of Christ. "The communion of the Holy Ghost" is the inner side of

¹ In the Early Church, as it is still in the Eastern Churches, the rite of Unction, along with the Imposition of Hands, followed immediately upon Baptism and formed an integral part of the same Sacrament. It was not till the 13th century that the Roman Church formally separated the two latter acts from Baptism, making them a distinct Sacrament of *Confirmation*. Before this time the chrism in the West appears for a while to have been used both in baptism and in the imposition of hands. The impartation of the Holy Ghost was specifically connected with the latter act, reserved for the bishop, while any priest baptizes.

all that is outwardly visible in Church activity and fellowship. It is the life of God in the society of men.

This Divine principle of life in Christ has at the same time an *antiseptic* power. It affords the real security for the Church's preservation from corruption and decay. The Spirit of God is the only, and sufficient, Infallibility on earth. He is our pledged protector against mortal sin and ruinous error, being the Holy Spirit and the Spirit of Truth, who "abideth with you," said Christ to His people, "and He shall be in you." It is His office to teach no less than to sanctify. To the true believer and faithful seeker after the knowledge of God He gives an instinct for truth, a sense for the Divine in knowledge and in doctrine, which works through the reason and yet above the reason, and which works collectively in the communion of saints. For this gift St. Paul had prayed long ago on behalf of these same Asian Christians: "that the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give to you a spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of Him—the eyes of your heart enlightened to know" the great things of God (Eph. i. 17–23). This prayer had been answered. Paul's and John's children in the faith were endowed with a Christian discernment that enabled them to detect the sophistries and resist the blandishments of subtle Gnostic error. This Spirit of wisdom and revelation has never deserted the Church. Through centuries rife with all kinds of ignorance and perversion the apostolic truth has been preserved to this day, and Scripture retains—it has recovered and extended after every eclipse—its unique authority.

"You know, all of you" (v. 20)—this is what the Apostle really says.¹ It is the most remarkable thing in the passage. "I have not written unto you," he continues,

¹ *οἴδατε πάντα*, not *πάντα*, is the best-attested reading. See R.V. margin, and Westcott's *Additional Note* (in his Commentary) on ii. 20.

"because you know not the truth, but because you know it, and because no lie is of the truth." He appeals to the judgment of the enlightened lay commonalty of the Church, just as St. Paul when he writes, "I speak as to men of sense; judge ye what I say." We look in spiritual matters too much to the opinion of the few, to experts and specialists—priests, councils, congresses; we have too little faith in the Holy Spirit dwelling in the Church, in the *communis sensus* of the body of Christ and the general suffrage of the citizens of the Divine commonwealth. Yet, however we may disguise the fact, it is with this grand jury that the verdict ultimately lies.

St. John's "chrism" certainly did not guarantee a precise agreement in all points of doctrine and of practice; but it covers essential truth, such as that of the Godhead of the Redeemer here in question. Much less does the witness of the Spirit warrant individual men, whose hearts are touched with His grace, in setting up to be oracles of God and mouthpieces of the Holy Ghost. In that case the Holy Spirit must contradict Himself endlessly, and God becomes the author of confusion and not of peace. But there is in matters of collective faith a spiritual common sense, a Christian public opinion in the communion of saints, behind the extravagancies of individuals and the party cries of the hour, which acts informally by a silent and impalpable pressure, but all the more effectually, after the manner of the Spirit. The motto of Vincent of Lerinum, so disastrously misapplied by Newman, is after all both true and indispensable: "Quod ubique, quod semper, quod *ab omnibus*."

(2) To this inward and cumulative witness there corresponds an outward witness, defined once for all. "You know *the truth* . . . that no lie is of *the truth*. . . . *That which you heard from the beginning*, let it abide in you" (vv. 21, 24).

Here is an objective criterion, given in the truth about

Christ and the Father as John's readers heard it from the Apostles at the first, and as we find it written in their books. Believing that to be true, the Church rejected promptly what did not square with it. In the most downright and peremptory fashion St. John asserts the apostolic witness to be a test of religious truth: "We are of God: he that knows God hears us; he that is not of God hears us not. By this we recognise the spirit of truth and the spirit of error" (iv. 6). His words echo those of Christ addressed to His first disciples: "As the Father sent Me, even so send I you . . . He that receiveth you, receiveth Me" (Matt. x. 40; John xx. 21). St. Paul made the like claim when he said, "If any man thinketh himself to be a prophet or spiritual, let him take knowledge of the things that I write unto you, that they are a commandment of the Lord" (1 Cor. xiv. 37). And this touchstone, however contested, is equally valid to-day.

Here is the exterior test of the inner light. The witness of the Spirit in the living Church, and in the abiding apostolic word, authenticate and guard each other. This must be so, if one and the self-same Spirit testifies in both. Experience and Scripture coincide. Neither will suffice us separated from the other. Without experience, Scripture becomes a dead letter; without the norm of Scripture, experience becomes a speculation, a fanaticism, or a conceit.

(3) The third guarantee cited by St. John lies outside ourselves and the Church: it is neither the chrism that rests upon all Christians, nor the apostolic message deposited with the Church in the beginning; it is *the faithfulness of our promise-giving Lord*. His fidelity is our ultimate dependence; and it is involved in the two safeguards previously described.

Accordingly, when the Apostle has said, in verse 24, "If that abide in you which ye heard from the beginning, ye too shall abide in the Son and the Father," he adds, to make all

sure, in the next verse; "And this is the promise which He promised us—the eternal life!" It is our Lord's own assurance over again, "Abide in Me, and I will abide in you . . . Verily, verily, I say unto you, If any one keep My word, death he will never see" (John viii. 51; xv. 4). The life of fellowship with the Father in the Son, which the antichrist would destroy at its root by denying the Son, the Son of God pledges Himself to maintain amongst those who are loyal to His word, and the word of His Apostles, which is virtually His own. On the rock He builds His Church; "the gates of death will not prevail against it," while it stands upon the true confession of His name. To the soul and to the Church, the individual believer and the community of faith, the same promise of life and incorruption is made. So long as we hold His word, He holds by us for ever.

He has promised us this (*αὐτὸς ἐπηγγείλατο*)—He who says, "I am the resurrection and the life." No brief or transient existence is that secured to His people, but "the eternal life." Now eternal life means with St. John, not as with St. Paul a prize to be won, but a foundation on which to rest, a fountain from which to draw; not a future attainment so much as a present divine, and therefore abiding, possession. It is the life which came into the world from God with Jesus Christ (i. 1, 2), and in which every soul has its part that is grafted into Him. Understanding this, we see that the promise of life eternal, in verse 25, is not brought in as an incitement to hope, but as a re-assurance to our troubled faith. "These things have I written unto you," the apostle says, "concerning those that mislead you" (v. 26). Christ's word is set against theirs. The promise of Christ stands fast, the unchanging rock amidst the tides of opinion and the winds of doctrine; unsapped by doubt, unshaken by the storms that break up one after another the strongest fabrics of human thought

and policy. Error cannot prevail against the truth as it is in Jesus. "Our little systems have their day"; but the fellowship of souls which rests upon the foundation of the Apostles has within it the power of an indissoluble life.

Such are the three guarantees of the permanence of Christian doctrine and the Christian life, as they were conceived by St. John and are asserted by him here at his last hour, when the tempests of persecution and sceptical error were on all sides let loose against the Church. They are the witness of the Spirit in the soul, the word on the lips of the Apostles transmitted by their pen, and the living Christ, the pledged executor of His own promise of eternal life.

GEORGE G. FINDLAY.

MR. CHARLES' APOCALYPSE OF BARUCH.

It is curious that just at the very time when traditionalists were congratulating themselves over the conversion of Harnack to critical orthodoxy (and certainly they have a right to such congratulation, for the preface to his new work on the *Chronology of the Early Christian Literature* is the biggest stroke of luck, from a controversial point of view, that has ever fallen in their way) there should have appeared in England a piece of critical investigation of which one could say with perfect confidence that it was "made in Germany"; for there is nothing except the title page to the contrary, and it displays all the methods of modern criticism, which for all practical purposes is Teutonic criticism, to the best advantage. So much so that we should not wonder if the book did not furnish a good field for a trial of strength between those who hold that there is always a presumption that a book is a unit and has an author, and those who hold that ancient books are very rarely single compositions, and that they hardly ever belong

to the authors whose names they bear or to the times in which those authors lived.

Mr. Charles' new work, *The Apocalypse of Baruch*, which he is the first to edit *from the Syriac in a form accessible to English readers, is the best example that English literature has ever had of the modern analysis of ancient books; and those to whom such criticism is still obscure cannot do better than study the way in which the artist unravels the tangled skein of authorship in the most beautiful of all the Apocalypses that have come down to us. The study can be made with great freedom from prejudice, for the Apocalypse in question is not a canonical book, and it can be handled with greater freedom than the Apocalypse in the New Testament, and without any conservative anxiety as to the results of the investigation—unless such anxiety should be provoked by the reflection that the disintegration of Baruch may have an inductive action upon Apocalyptic literature generally, not excluding the New Testament.

Now of Oriental and semi-Oriental books we may say what one would say of Oriental cities, that they are usually examples of rebuilding, and that it is very seldom that the stones are from one quarry or hewn at one period. The same instinct which takes the pillars of one temple to adorn another, and makes the walls of a house unprofitably gay with votive tablets from public buildings that have fallen into ruin, appears in literature in the adaptation of works which have become unpopular, or obsolescent, to the needs of a later day than that of their first authors, and to political and religious ends which are often the direct opposites of what was intended at their first publication. Probably the Apocalyptic literature furnishes a better proof of this adaptation than any other kind of books. For, of necessity, most Apocalypses are short-lived; they are not, and unless they are eschatologically inspired can-

not be, eternal in the heavens; their subject matter is the agony of an hour, it may be of the birth-pangs of the Messiah, or it may be of some lesser and more local dolours; but inasmuch as the story of the Apocalypse is the pain of one member only in the body of suffering humanity, and the solution of the anguish is predicted as the welfare of that particular member, we can hardly expect that a permanent place in literature can be found for the average Apocalypse. Who would expect the world to be permanently interested in the sorrows of Barcocheba, or to consider the siege of Bether as more than a *mauvais quart d'heure* in universal history. If Apocalypses did not betray themselves by indulging in false prophecies, they would be betrayed by their own exaggerations of the relative proportions of a political and religious situation. The only thing that saved them from oblivion is that they had the courage, the magnificent courage, to deal with the fortunes of the Kingdom of God; and if modern criticism is right in its outlook, even this preservative has been but partially operative. Many have perished for one that survives.

We admit that it is difficult to appreciate or reconstruct a lost literature. Ask the majority of traditional critics whether there was any literary activity in Palestine in the hundred and fifty years preceding the birth of our Lord, and they will probably reply in a manner which shows that they believe that literature in that period was as dead as prophecy. To say that our Lord had a library, by which we only mean that other books were accessible to Him besides those which formed the accepted Jewish Canon, sounds fantastic and preposterous, especially to the person who suspects that such books might be held to have coloured the thought or affected the style of the Master. It is only slowly that it has dawned upon the students of theology that the period immediately before the Advent was one of intense literary activity. We are always ready to

label an unknown region as Sahara, until exploration forces the contrary upon us.

We make these remarks in the interests of Mr. Charles' new book, for we confess to have been startled at the number of authors that he has brought to light; they are not single spies, but Apocalyptic battalions of Pharisees, Sadducees, and Zealots. They are like the "never-ending line" of Wordsworth's daffodils, only they are not a jocund company, and they do not fill our hearts with permanent or recurrent rapture. They multiply like Banquo's offspring when seen in the witches' glasses as if they would stretch till the crack of doom, and orthodox criticism knows that they will push us from our stools. It is almost as bad as Pentateuch criticism to be told that it took at least eight people to write the *Apocalypse of Baruch*; and that is not the worst of it, as will be seen as we proceed.

Of the books which may properly be called Apocalyptic, the most important, outside of the Canon, are Enoch, the fourth book of Ezra, and Baruch. Under the latter title we do not include the Old Testament Apocrypha which bear the name of the friend of Jeremiah, but that group of books which includes the *Apocalypse of Baruch*, the *Rest of the Words of Baruch*, and one or two other similar books of which traces are extant. A very slight acquaintance with these works suffices to establish the priority in a general sense of the book of Enoch which is clearly also anterior to most of the New Testament books, upon which it has left distinct traces. The other books mentioned have been the subjects of keen critical contention. There is much common matter and common method in *Fourth Ezra* and in the *Apocalypse of Baruch*; as for the tract called the *Rest of the Words of Baruch*, it is certainly based upon the Greek form (unhappily lost) of the *Apocalypse of Baruch*; and as Mr. Charles accepts my proof that the *Rest of the Words* was written in the year 136 A.D. or thereabouts, it will be seen

that the older parts of the Baruch and Ezra literature go back to at least as far as the time of production of the New Testament itself. They belong to the environment if not to the antecedents of the New Testament; they reproduce for us the literary and intellectual air which was breathed by apostolic and subapostolic men, though perhaps the atmosphere is sometimes surcharged with sulphur.

Now it has been a grave question whether of the two, the *Apocalypse of Baruch* and the *Fourth Book of Ezra* is the earlier, and whether one of them is indebted to the other.

Many leading critics have held that Baruch was a later form of Ezra, with important theological modifications; amongst these are such weighty names as those of Ewald, Renan, Drummond, Hilgenfeld, and Dillmann. But over against these stands a strong opposition, of which the chief is perhaps Schürer, who maintains the very opposite theory, viz., that Baruch is the earlier work.

Mr. Charles, in England, and Kabisch, in Germany, say that both of the contesting schools have brought forward valid arguments, but that they are vitiated by the assumption that each of the books is by a single hand. So far from this being the case, Mr. Charles affirms there are in the extant *Apocalypse of Baruch* the remains of three Messianic Apocalypses, of one primitive Apocalypse of Baruch, of two subsequent Apocalypists, of some passages by a Sadducean hand, and of a final editor—eight authors, if we have counted rightly. But then we have to consider that *Fourth Ezra* is also composite, and it consists (following Kabisch's analysis as a working hypothesis) of a Salathiel-Apocalypse, an Ezra-Apocalypse, an Eagle-Vision, a Son-of-Man Vision, an Ezra-Fragment, all brought together by an editor belonging to the Zealot party—six more Apocalypists, making fourteen in all, in place of the two about whom the critics have been hitherto bandying words confusedly. How in-

teresting these books will be when printed in the Polychrome edition of the New Testament! And this is not all; for, when we dig into the text itself, fresh Apocalyptic matter turns up ("and often when I go to plough, the ploughshare turns them out"). For example, in the commentary on chap. xxix. 4 we have a note on the passage that "Behemoth shall be revealed from his place, and Leviathan will ascend from the sea, those two great monsters which I created on the fifth day of creation. And I kept them until that time, and then they will be for food for all that are left." The parallel to this in Fourth Ezra vi. 49-52 is, "And then thou hast preserved two animals: the name of the one thou hast called Behemoth, and the name of the second thou hast called Leviathan, and thou hast separated them one from the other, for the seventh part where the water was could not contain them. And thou gavest Behemoth one part which was dried up on the third day, that he might dwell in it, where are a thousand mountains; but to Leviathan thou gavest the seventh part, which is the moist part, and thou hast preserved them that they may be for food for whom thou wilt and when thou wilt." Mr. Charles argues ingeniously that neither of these passages suffices exactly to explain the other, and with characteristic boldness says that they are both using the text of a lost hexaëmeron or story of the six days of Creation. And if this be true, and there is much to be said for it, the number of authors with whom we have to deal is *fifteen*, and more may probably be found.

Now are we tending towards an absurdity, and arriving at the place where the chorus is entitled to interject "risum teneatis amici?" By no means; for we turn up some things which look like verifications. For example, the reader will notice in the preceding extract from iv. Ezra that there is a knowledge of Hebrew involved; the writer has assigned to Behemoth a place where there are a

thousand mountains: this is due to the expression of the Psalmist, "the cattle (*behemoth*) upon a thousand hills." Yet it comes in quite incidentally; it is not borrowed from Baruch, and there is no air of research about it. How are we to explain this Hebrew allusion? Mr. Charles would reply, Baruch and Ezra were both written in Hebrew. The suggestion had been made before, but not so as to deserve much attention. It is startling to be told that two leading Apocalypses, of which one, Baruch, is extant in Syriac, and the other in versions derived from a lost Greek text, go back behind their Greek texts into Hebrew originals! But the verisimilitude increases as we read a little further in Baruch. If Baruch was originally Hebrew, the lost hexaëmeron, which told of Behemoth and Leviathan, was Hebrew also. But in Baruch there follows immediately the story of the Vine with the Ten Thousand Clusters and the Wheat with the Ten Thousand Ears, which Papias put, in a slightly different form, into the mouth of our Lord. Mr. Charles does not refer this story to his lost hexaëmeron, though I do not see why not, but to a lost Apocalypse (add one in that case to our number of lost books). Now the interesting point is that I had demonstrated in the EXPOSITOR for 1895, pp. 448, 449, that this story must have been primitively *in Hebrew*, for it presupposes either a various reading or a variant interpretation in the blessing of Isaac (Gen. xxvii. 28), where by reading רב as רבוי we turn "plenty of corn and wine" into "10,000 of corn and wine," which is explained as what will happen in the days of the Messianic felicity. Mr. Charles endorses my explanation, and points out that the legend already exists in a simple form in the book of Enoch x. 19 ("all the seed which is sown will bear *ten thousand*"). So here we are back on Hebrew ground, and Mr. Charles has certainly found confirmation for his theory that Baruch and iv. Ezra are independent and that they are primitively Hebrew.

But it is time to turn sceptic, and see what can be adduced against Mr. Charles' disintegrations. The main difficulty to me seems still to lie in the explanation that he requires us to find of the similarity in structure of the two Apocalypses and their internal nexus. So striking is this similarity that it was held by Ewald (and Mr. Charles points out that Ryle inclines to the same view) that the two Apocalypses are by the same hand. But this view adds the difficulties which are involved in the internal inconsistency of each Apocalypse with itself to those which are involved in their inconsistency with one another, and removes no part of the problem from the region of dispute except the single question of priority. We may admit so much to Mr. Charles, and yet revert to the singular literary parallelisms between the two books, and ask whether they can be satisfactorily explained by a theory of common sources.

We will take a single example by way of illustration. I have pointed out in my edition of the *Rest of the Words of Baruch* that there is an Apocalyptic prominence given in this branch of literature to Hebron and the Oak of Abraham. This oak was held to be oracular, a parallel to the burning bush of Moses (as is sometimes stated in plain words, but is always implied). Here God talks with man in vision or by angelic visitation, and the place is so holy that no buildings are allowed in the precincts. It is as much an oracle as Delphi or Dodona. Consequently, we must read these Apocalypses under the oak at Mamre, if we are to understand them rightly.

Turn to *Apoc. Baruch*, c. vi., and we find that Baruch leaves the people, and goes forth and stands by the oak. According to the context, this oak should be in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem. Fritzsche compared this oak with the oak at Hebron, but, according to Mr. Charles, this is an erroneous reference. We think Fritzsche is right, and that Baruch has misunderstood what he is working on; for in

c. lxxvii. 18 we again find Baruch sitting under the shadow of the branches of an oak; further, in c. lv. 1, we find the words, "I sat there under *the* tree (so, not as translated by Charles, 'under the shadow of a tree') that I might rest under the shadow of the branches." The tree is obviously again the oak, and in each case the question has to be asked, "What oak?" In c. 47 Baruch says, "I go to Hebron, for thither the Mighty One hath sent me." If the book were from a single author, we should say that it was obvious that the writer had prepared the scene for Baruch's visions under the oak at Hebron, and the only misunderstanding was one in geography; he did not know how far it was from Jerusalem to Hebron. In other words, he was not a Jerusalem man, but a person working under the influence of Jerusalem documents. But, whether the Apocalypse of Baruch is a single composition or not, the influence of Hebron and Mamre upon it is clear.

Mr. Charles allows that three of his sources are involved in the question, for c. lv. 1 (alluding to "the tree") comes, according to him, from his third Messiah-Apocalypse, A₃, and the allusions to "the oak" from the source which he culls B₁, the primitive Baruch-Apocalypse, while the allusion to "Hebron" he is inclined to refer to his source B₂. Now, as we cannot detach either "the tree" or "the oak" from an origin which is ultimately the oracle at Hebron, we are obliged to admit that three out of Mr. Charles' sources are Hebron-Apocalypses. The difficulty is a real one; it is not merely that the sources are too numerous, but that they begin to have a family likeness. One feels like asking again whether the use of iv. Ezra, which is altogether rooted in Hebron, would not be a more satisfactory explanation. We make the suggestion not with the idea that we have upset Mr. Charles' argument for divided authorship, but merely in the desire for more illumination on what is to us a difficult point in the analysis. Perhaps it will grow

clearer as we become more familiar with the disintegration which Mr. Charles has effected.

Turning to the notes which accompany the translation, we can only say that they are a mine of information on Judæo-Christian matters. We were especially interested with Mr. Charles' note on the sin of Manasseh; according to Baruch, he had made an image with five faces, four of which looked to the four winds, and the fifth, on the summit, was an adversary of the zeal of the Mighty One. Readers of Ephrem's *Commentary on the Diatessaron* will remember that he explains "the seven evil spirits" of the Gospel as those which entered into Israel, and counts four of them as derived from the four-faced image of Manasseh. Now, Mr. Charles points out that this curious gloss upon 2 Chronicles xxxiii. 7 is already in the Peshito, and we may therefore assume that Ephrem derived his knowledge of Manasseh's sin from the text of the Peshito, where the image is said to have been "an image with four faces," and no mention is made of a fifth. What is significant is the antiquity of the gloss, which appears in the most evolved form in Baruch as early as A.D. 100(?), if we may trust the date assigned to this part of the book by Mr. Charles. Mr. Charles refers also to Talmud, *Sanhedrin*, 103*b*, where it is said that Manasseh "made for his idol one face, and in the end he made for it four faces, that the Shekinah might see it and be provoked." This appears to correspond with Baruch's "adversary of the zeal of the Mighty One," quoted above. But both expressions run back into the Hebrew text, "to do evil before the Lord, and provoke Him." And no explanation has apparently yet been found of the statement that Manasseh made an image with four (or five) faces.

In c. xxix. 7 and c. lxxiii. 2, where we have the expressions, "clouds distilling the dew of health," "healing will descend in dew," a reference should have been made to the

passage of the Old Testament upon which the Apocalyptist is working. It is Isaiah xxvi. 19, according to the LXX., which underlies the passage. How will this affect the theory of a Hebrew original?

There are a number of errors in the printing of the Syriac which the reader will readily correct.

Whether Mr. Charles succeeds in establishing all his positions or not, he has certainly written a very valuable work, for which the students of Apocalyptic Literature will give him their hearty thanks.

J. RENDEL HARRIS.

THE LAMB ON THE THRONE.

(REVELATION V. AND VI.)

THERE are two opposite things which cause a literary work to suffer—the unpopularity or the over-popularity of its subject. It may deal with themes so high as to be above the common appreciation; or it may be so intimately connected with the interests of life that its phrases have become household words. The Bible belongs to the last of these. Strange as it may sound, it is not too much to say that its literature has suffered from its own popularity. Its words have become so familiar that to the mass of readers they have lost their freshness. We have come to associate the Bible with simplicity as distinguished from originality. We look upon it as the wisdom of God seen through the foolishness of man, a rich gem in a very mean casket. A greater delusion is not to be conceived. Lord Byron says, that from being compelled to repeat the odes of Horace at school he was never able in after life to see their literary beauty. This is still more true of the Bible. We are taught its words before we can understand the half of their meaning. I do not condemn the practice;

I think it right. None the less it has the effect of blinding us in after years to the value of the case in which the jewel is enshrined, and preventing us from realising the fact that, even on their human side, the books of the Bible contain more originality of conception than the boldest flights of Shakspeare or the subtlest immersions of Browning.

There is no better illustration of this than that passage of the Apocalypse which we have made the subject of our present study. We have become so familiar with the expression "the Lamb on the throne" that we have ceased to see an image of it; or rather, it would be more correct to say, most of us never do see till later life the image which it implies. Yet, nothing is more certain than that the first impression of these words must have been one of the most startling originality. Throw yourself back into the standpoint of that world to which they were first uttered; you will find that they must have been ringing with paradox. To that old world the idea of a lamb on a throne was a contradiction in terms. I do not mean that the ancient earth was a stranger to gentleness. I do not mean that the poets of the olden time would have excluded the softer emotions from the life of their heroes. To combine in one nature the elements of the lion and of the lamb would be as natural for Livy as it was for the writer of the Apocalypse. But the old Pagan world, like the pre-Christian Jewish world, could never say of this element of gentleness, "Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory"; the kingdom, the power, and the glory were not for *it*. The part of man's nature reserved for them was the self-asserting part. No nation that I know had a lamb as a symbol of its greatness. The Roman would have understood an eagle on the throne, for his ideal was the soaring of ambition. The Jew would have understood a lion on the throne, for his Messiah was a physical conqueror, and

the strength he worshipped was the strength of roaring. But the lamb was ever a victim, the symbol of the vanquished, the sign of the dependent soul. Its place was not the throne, but the altar; it could never be the emblem of dominion.

Think, now, how startling must have been the utterance of the seer of Patmos. Into the heart of the Roman world a new and paradoxical symbol of royalty is suddenly introduced. An object which had always been the emblem of impotence is made the centre of dominion; the lamb is "*in the midst of the throne.*" Not only so, but there is more than that. The seer carefully guards us against the delusion that the lamb has obtained the supremacy by changing its nature and becoming a lion. Such transformations are possible. But the seer tells us that the lamb is in the midst of the throne, not only in its own nature, but in its typical act of sacrifice, "a lamb in the attitude of being slain." That is the real sense of the passage, and it is one of deep significance. It suggests to us that even in our days we have a wrong view of Christ's exaltation. What is our view of Christ's exaltation? It is that He has vanquished His cross, ceased to be a servant, and become once more a king. St. John says it is the reverse. It is the cross itself which has been exalted, it is the servant himself who has been ennobled. The point is so striking as to demand a moment's reflection.

No one will deny that at the present hour Christ occupies a different position in the world from that which He held in the first century of our era. He has passed from the foot to the head of the social ladder; He has become the name that is above every name. This will be admitted by all classes—believing and unbelieving. What is the cause of this transformation? Is it that Christianity exerts more physical power over the world in our days than it did in the days of St. John? Assuredly not. In point of fact it does

not exert more physical power. There are laws in every Christian land as to the regulation of Christian worship, but no individual man is compelled to worship. Why then is it that, in some sense, men of every creed and of no creed bow down before the name of Jesus? It is because the thing which the old world disparaged is the thing which the new world prizes. We are living after the resurrection; but let us never forget that it is the resurrection of the Crucified. The Christ who has risen from the grave is not a Christ who has triumphed over suffering; it is a Christ in whom suffering has triumphed. We worship Christ as a servant and because He is a servant. We reverence Him because we see a perpetuation of those things which His first disciples wished to come to an end. We adore Him because that cross, which to the Jew was a stumbling-block, and to the Greek foolishness, has become to us the power and the wisdom of God. The exaltation of Christ in modern times is the exaltation precisely of that element which the ancient world suppressed; and the Christ who has ascended to the right hand of the Father is precisely that Christ who was laid in an ignominious grave.

Such is the fact—a sober fact of history, nay, an object of present experience. It was foreseen and stated in advance by the seer of Patmos at a time when everything pointed in an opposite direction. What was the line of thought in the mind of this man? What was the train of ideas which led him to a conclusion so remote from that reached by his contemporaries? Can we trace the steps of the process by which he arrived at a conviction so intensely out of harmony with the spirit of his own age, so closely in sympathy with the best instincts of ours? Let us try.

And let us begin by asking what was that kingdom which the seer of Patmos had in his mind when he claimed for Christ the throne of universal dominion. His readers evidently understood him to mean the supremacy of the

Jewish nation. I do not think he had any such notion. The idea of a sacrificial lamb being at the height of empire was a thought foreign to the Jew, foreign even to the Jewish Christian. To the son of Israel the lamb was always an emblem of humiliation, never an instrument of conquest. He would have placed a lamb on the altar, never a lamb on the throne. And, from his own point of view, he was right. If the empire to be conquered be a physical one, it is not a lamb that will do it. Physical unruliness can only be controlled by physical rule. If the forces arrayed against the people of God be outward forces, then the kingdom can only be taken by violence, and the power that shall take it must be the reverse of lamb-like. No man who looked for a physical conquest could for a moment have conceived the simile of a world held in restraint by the power of a sacrificial life.

But suppose now we test the logic of St. John's words by another empire. For there is another empire—a kingdom more unruly than the physical, more lawless, more hard to subdue and more difficult to keep; it is the dominion of the human heart. Moreover, when we consult the earliest Christian writings we find that this and not the other is always the kingdom spoken of. Our Lord says that His kingdom comes not with observation, that out of the *heart* proceed all unruly things and all things to be restrained, that, if His kingdom were one of this world, His servants would require to fight; in other words, its forces could not be subdued by a lamb. And when we turn to the first attempt at a church history—the book of Acts, we are confronted on the very opening page by a passage which clenches the argument. The disciples ask, “Wilt Thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?” They are answered that they shall receive power when the Holy Ghost has come upon them. What is this but, in other words, to say that the kingdom lies in the spirit, that the enemies to be

conquered are in the heart, and that the power which would conquer them must pass through the heart. When, therefore, we hear St. John speaking of a lamb on the throne, and interpret it as a dominion over the heart, it is not fair to say that we are allegorising St. John. We are giving his first and original meaning; we are removing his metaphor. John himself is the allegorist. He has clothed an abstract truth in an image; we divest it of the image, and it re-appears again as the old, old story, the first story, the story which Christ told to His disciples when the seed was sown.

The kingdom to be conquered, then, is the heart; we may consider this as settled. The next question is, How is the conquest to be made? Now, at the time when St. John wrote there had already been three attempts to deal with the problem of the heart. They may be described under the names Stoicism, Buddhism, and Judaism; but they represent tendencies which have appeared from time to time under many names. If I might be allowed to express epigrammatically their separate import, I would say that they aimed respectively to pluck the flower, wither the flower, and stunt the flower. Stoicism proposed to quell the passions of the heart by plucking out the heart altogether; it sought to get rid of temptation by getting rid of feeling. Buddhism proposed to quell the passions of the heart by teaching that the heart itself was a delusion, that every pursuit of human desire ended in the discovery that the object was a shadow. Judaism proposed to quell the passions of the heart by the restraining hand of fear; it proclaimed the presence of a lawgiver; it set up an embankment against the flood; it kept the tree of life by the cherubim and the flaming sword.

Now, to these three methods there is one thing in common—they all achieve their end by *contracting* the object of their search. Their aim is to conquer a certain

tract of country ; they do conquer it, but they reduce it to ashes in the process. Can any of these systems be said to possess the throne of the heart? Can Stoicism? The heart is burned up in its march to victory ; man ceases to be tempted by ceasing to feel. Can Buddhism? The heart is prevented from sinning, not by its conviction that the object is bad, but simply and solely by its despair of reaching it. Can Judaism? The heart is kept from doing evil by the continual presence of a policeman and the continual fear of that presence ; it is only saved by law. Does any of these involve the possession of a throne? To return to the old simile, the flower has indeed been made to suffer a change ; but in every case it has been a change by contraction ; it has lost its power of harmfulness by losing power all round. The Stoic has plucked it ; the Buddhist has withered it ; the Jew has stunted it. It is a conquest without a kingdom, a victory without a prize, a triumph that has been only purchased by the mutilation of what was made to be beautiful.

Now, this is not the conquest which any man desires. Even in the physical sphere, what a potentate seeks is an extended, not a contracted possession. In the sphere of the heart it is the same. The reason why we object to lawless passion in the soul is that it contracts the soul. That is the tendency of the disease, and we wish to counteract it. We do not want to cure either by plucking, withering, or stunting the flower ; we wish to expand it. We wish to cure lawless passion on the homœopathic principle—by creating passion on the other side. It is more life and fuller that we want. We do not desire to arrest temptation simply by plucking out the right eye and cutting off the right hand. We would neutralise them by introducing another eye, by creating another hand. “Walk in the spirit,” says Paul, “and you will not fulfil the lusts of the flesh.” He means that you will never conquer the

lusts of the heart by contraction, by restraint, by prohibition, by the threat of the fires of hell. You want a counterpassion, an opposing attraction, a positive stimulus pushing the other way. The desire of the flesh can only be met by the desire of the spirit—the thing called love. The flower, which is merely contracted by being plucked, or withered, or stunted, is subdued at last by a process of expansion. It yields to the power of light, and, in yielding, its forces are brought out as they never were before. It reaches its own glory when it surrenders itself to the sun. It finds the secret of its being when it is clothed in a higher element. It blooms in the power by which it has been taken captive.

Now, remember that to St. John light is ever the analogue of love. He applies the two names as synonymous descriptions of God. And why? Because to his mind there was an identity between the process of the redemption of the flower by light and the redemption of the heart by love. We have seen that the light conquers the flower. We have seen that it conquers, not by contracting, but by expanding the flower. But there is one other thing which must be added to this; it conquers by dying for the flower; ere it can bring out the bloom, it must itself be slain. For, what is the process by which the flower is kindled? It is an act of death on the part of the kindling substance. It is not merely that when the flower gets above the ground the sunbeam is ready to crown it. That is the very smallest thing which the sunbeam has to do. It is in the ground itself it must first meet the flower. It must come down to the place of its burial. It must descend to the roots of its being. It must seek it in its humiliation, in its undergroundness, in its want of grace and beauty. So far from waiting till it grows, it must itself be the principle of its growth. It must go down to it in the dark and in the cold, must take part in its darkness and its coldness. If it reaps the glory of its resurrection, it is be-

cause it shares the ignominy of its grave. It sits upon the throne by reason of its sacrifice.

Such is the thought which St. John sees in light and transfers to love. He sees Christ sitting on the throne of human hearts—King, by the most infallible mode of conquest, and by a conquest that enhances the value of the possession. He asks what is the source of this empire; and the answer is not far. He feels that such devotion could only be got if it had first been given. He feels that, if the flower of the heart has blossomed toward the day, it must be through the power of the day itself. Christ has kindled the flower by sharing in its burial. His throne is built upon the steps of His sacrifice. He reigns by the attractive power of a love which He has Himself woven into human hearts, and woven by His own pierced hand. He has won universal love by stooping to that lowest round of the ladder where all universal things are. The common want is at the foot, on the ground floor. Every knee has bent to Him because He has taken on Himself the wants of the undermost servant. Had He stooped to anything short of the valley of death, He might have conquered the upper strata; by touching the lowermost He conquered all. He holds the throne of His dominion in the attitude of a lamb that has been slain.

GEORGE MATHESON.

THE CENSUS OF QUIRINIUS.

I.

THE difficulties caused by the association established in Luke ii. 1 between the birth of Christ and a *census* taken in Judæa at the order of the Emperor Augustus are well known. Dr. Schürer devotes thirty-four pages in his *Gesch. des Jüd. Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi* to the subject, and any discussion of the difficulties might properly be rested on the foundation of his learned and careful work; but it is better merely to acknowledge my debt to him, and to leave our difference of opinion unnoticed. In the EXPOSITOR for January, 1897, p. 72, it is mentioned that exigencies of time prevented me at the moment from stating an argument on this subject. The pledge implied may be now redeemed; and though it is obviously beyond the bounds of an article to discuss the subject as a whole, one point at least, which is of central importance, may be illustrated.

The words of Luke should, as I believe, be understood thus: "There was issued a decree by Cæsar Augustus that *census* should be taken of the entire Roman world; this [with which we are concerned] took place, the first census [of the series], while Quirinius was administering the province Syria."

I believe that the synchronisms in Luke ii. 1, 2 and iii. 1, 2 are founded on a careful and extended study of history, and that the author wished to place Christian history in its proper position on the background of Roman history. Obviously it is impossible to maintain that view, if the first synchronism, which he establishes at such a critical point in his narrative, is a mere blunder, not merely erroneous in some detail, but involving false views in a number of essential points (as some scholars maintain).

Either this synchronism is right in essentials, or Luke was incapable of making correctly what must have been in his time a very simple investigation.

Now it is an all-important principle that, in contradistinction to Paul, who fully comprehends and adopts the Roman point of view (which he had been educated¹ from infancy to appreciate), Luke speaks of things Roman as they appeared to a Greek; the Greeks never could quite understand Roman matters, and Luke often uses popular and not strictly accurate terms for Roman things.² So it is in this case; he alone preserves for us here the memory of a principle and a fact of Roman organization, but he expresses it in untechnical language. What his meaning was will be brought out in the following pages.

We observe, as a preliminary, that Luke certainly knew of more than one "enrolment" or *census*. In *Acts* v. 37 he speaks of "*the census*," "*the great census*" (*ἡ ἀπογραφή*), meaning thereby the *census* taken about A.D. 6 by Quirinius; in the Gospel, chapter ii. 1, he speaks of a "*first census*." By no possibility can he have reckoned these two to be identical (except on the view that he was stupidly and incorrigibly inaccurate—a supposition which is not likely to be seriously maintained, but, if any one does maintain it, it would be useless to argue with him).

The suggestion has been made that the indictional periods of fifteen years began to run from the census of Quirinius. The indictions are not known to have been in use earlier than the fourth century, and are supposed to run from 312 (the year of the decisive victory of the Christian over the Pagan Emperor near the Mulvian Bridge); but if, as is held by many, the *census* of Quirinius occurred in B.C. 3, it would be the beginning of an indictional period. As we shall see, this suggestion is not correct, though it has

¹ *St. Paul*, pp. 30 f., 111, 135, 255, etc.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 225, 315.

a certain relation to the truth; the indictions and the indictional periods are a fourth century idea.

The sense given to *πρώτη* is, as I believe, the critical point in this statement; and, as is pointed out elsewhere,¹ this adjective must denote the first of several occurrences, and cannot simply be used, as some have suggested, to mean "the earlier of the two *census* held by Quirinius."² It implies that Luke thought of a series of census as having been taken in the Roman world. This force of *πρώτη*, which would be necessary in good Greek, is rejected for Luke and Paul by most scholars on the ground that in "New Testament Greek" the degrees of comparison were confused. That some New Testament writers confuse the force of comparative and superlative is true; but I must steadily protest against summing the style of them all up under the one category of "New Testament Greek." It is quite unscholarly to quote, *e.g.*, John to illustrate Luke's language. It is a well-known fact that the influence of the Semitic expression led the Carthaginians to blur the distinction of comparative and superlative in Latin,³ and the Hellenist Jews to blur that distinction in Greek. But it will in time be recognised that the attempt to treat Luke as blurring that distinction results in some serious misunderstandings of his meaning.⁴

Several points which are involved in Luke's statement have been, and are, disputed. In the first place, it is

¹ *St. Paul the Trav.*, p. 27.

² See Dr. Plummer's edition of Luke (a work that has been most useful to me), p. 49. If any one wishes to appreciate one reason why there has been so little progress made in the understanding of New Testament history in recent years, he has only to read over the list of interpretations of this passage mentioned and rejected by Dr. Plummer on p. 50. To the plain student of Classical Literature and History it is hard to see how such interpretations could ever have been seriously proposed, except on the theory that nothing was too absurd for an early Christian writer.

³ See *Arch. für latein. Lexicogr.*, vii. p. 480.

⁴ *St. Paul the Trav.*, p. 26 f.

argued that the principle of taking a general census of the empire was never contemplated by Augustus. This would be a fatal objection to his statement, if it could be proved, and the chief aim of my paper is to meet it. Gardthausen, the latest historian of Augustus, speaks most emphatically on this point. After quoting Luke's words, he declares that, for Augustus's plans, a general census of the empire was neither necessary nor suitable.¹ Gardthausen here displays a familiarity with Augustus's intentions which is not justified by the evidence, and there is not given in his excellent (though not quite complete) statement of the evidence² anything to justify such a sweeping negative. He is not justified in saying more than that no evidence was known to him supporting Luke's statement as to Augustus's aims.

Now let us turn to the facts of history. Some years ago the discovery was made nearly simultaneously by three different scholars³ that periodical *census* were made in Egypt under the Roman Empire. The following occurrences of the *census* are proved with certainty, viz., in the years 89-90, 103-104, 117-118, 131-132, and so on until 229-230, and to these one authority adds 75-76 as highly probable.⁴ The remarkable fact is that these dates establish beyond question that the *census* were held according to a cycle of fourteen years, not of fifteen. The technical terms used in Egypt, ἀπογραφή and ἀπογράφειν, are the same that Luke employs.

The question remains, Who was the originator of the cycle? Every one who has familiarized himself with the

¹ "Ein allgemeiner Reichscensus war dazu weder nöthig noch zweckmässig." Gardthausen, *Augustus und seine Zeit*, part I., vol. ii., p. 923 (1896).

² *Op. cit.*, part II., vol. ii., p. 531 ff.

³ Kenyon, in *Classical Review*, 1893, p. 110; Wilcken, in *Hermes*, xxviii., 1893, p. 203 ff.; Viereck, in *Philologus*, iii., 1893, p. 219 ff. The purpose was enumeration and conscription, not taxation (Wilcken, p. 248 f.).

⁴ Viereck, *loc. cit.* The census under Vespasian is not fixed.

development of Roman administration under the empire will recognise straight away the strong probability that any important device of organization, which is known to have been in existence as early as Vespasian, must have come from Augustus; and especially in Egypt, where the Romans fell heirs to a highly organized administration, it is almost certain that this *census*-cycle went back to Augustus's administration. That principle, doubtless, would be universally admitted. But, fortunately, we are not left to mere general probability as confirming the precise and clear statement of Luke. We have definite evidence that the earlier *census* were made in various places and parts of the empire. The earliest periods of the *census* would be 23-22 B.C., 9-8 B.C., 5-6 A.D.,¹ and so on. The periods, then, started from the beginning of Augustus's reign in the most formal sense: the emperors reckoned their reign according to the tenure of the *tribunicia potestas*, and Augustus received the *tribunicia potestas* on 27th June, B.C. 23.

The first *census*-period, then, if our interpretation of Luke's word "first" is correct, must be supposed to have begun in 9-8 B.C.; and this year was, in all probability, selected as the fifteenth of Augustus's tribunician power and reign. In that year, as Augustus mentions in his review of his own life,² he took a *census* of the Roman citizens, who were 4,233,000 in number. But these reviews of the Roman citizens were held at irregular intervals, the first in 28 B.C. and the third in 14 A.D.; so that this fact, taken alone, would be of no importance. It is, however, important to notice that a *census* was held in Syria at that time; Sentius Saturninus governed Syria B.C. 9-7,³ and

¹ Wilcken, *Hermes*, 1893, p. 245, makes an arithmetical error of one year as to the periods before Christ.

² *Monumentum Ancyranum*, ii. 5-8 (ed. Mommsen, p. 39).

³ Liebenam and others say 8-6; but his successor, Varus, ruled in the years 6-4; and Lewin, *Fasti Sacri*, rightly points out that Saturninus came to Syria in 9.

Tertullian mentions that a *census* was held in Judæa by him.¹

This is a remarkable statement, and its apparent discrepancy with Luke has caused much discussion. Several points in it are important to observe. (1) Tertullian did not content himself with making use of Luke; on the contrary, he differs from Luke; (2) Tertullian evidently must have consulted historical authorities, and found record of a provincial *census*. Now that the *census*-periods are fixed, we see that his procedure was probably as follows: he investigated the *census*-periods, and found that the first, in 9-8 B.C., began under the governor Sentius Saturninus. This *census* was probably held in the Roman province, and mentioned in Roman documents accessible to Tertullian. (3) Tertullian must, indubitably, have observed the difference between his statement and Luke's; and he preferred the evidence of the Roman documents.

We know from Pliny, *Hist. Nat.*, vii. 48 (159), that the records of the Italian *census* were so carefully preserved that in A.D. 48 Claudius could verify from the records of the earlier *census* the assertion made by a citizen of Bologna as to his age. The discoveries of Egyptian papyri show that there also the *census* records were preserved; and we may infer that the same rule was observed in every province. Accurate observation, registration, and preservation of all facts were the basis of Roman government; and a historian who wished to discover the facts of the early empire could easily do it if he were not disgracefully lazy or uncommonly stupid. With a man of ordinary ability and care, serious error proceeded only from intention to mislead (though a slip in some unimportant detail may be made by any man, however careful).

¹ Tert., *adv. Marc.*, iv. 19: "*census actos sub Augusto in Judæa per Sentium Saturninum.*" The preposition is regularly used to indicate that the Emperor carried out an action through the instrumentality of a governor of a province.

Further, in the year 8 B.C. Augustus gave Rome a municipal organization, divided it into regions and quarters, and in a certain class of inscriptions that year is reckoned as the year 1 of an epoch, which remained in use for some little time.¹ The year was, therefore, a marked and literally epoch-making year; and this is natural, if it was the beginning of an intended imperial system of universal registration. I say an intended system, because it would appear that the idea was too great for the time, and was not fully carried into effect. The administration of the empire was not sufficiently perfect and continuous in its working to carry out such a gigantic idea; and Augustus himself, as he grew old and feeble, neglected to carry it out himself in Rome; so that the next *census* there was not held until Tiberius had been associated with him in the empire. Dion Cassius indeed mentions that in 4 A.D. (a full year too soon) Augustus made a partial *census* of Roman citizens; but, as Mommsen and others have pointed out, Dion Cassius is certainly wrong about two of the four Roman *census*² which he attributes to Augustus; and his assertion as to the *census* of 4 A.D. cannot be credited on his sole authority, and is rejected by Mommsen.³

The second *census*-period fell in 5-6 A.D. Now, in 6 A.D. Quirinius was governor of Syria for the second time; and we know from Josephus that he was specially charged to make a *census* and valuation of the province.⁴ Moreover, an inscription (carried to Venice from Berytus), which was long dismissed as a forgery concocted to support Luke, but is now proved to be genuine by the discovery of the

¹ The year 1 A.D. is called *nono anno* in a well-known inscription, published in *Bullett. di Commiss. Arch. Rom.*, 1892, p. 67, and *Arch. Epigr. Mittheil. aus Oesterr.*, 1891, p. 77.

² He knew that Augustus held only three *census*, and explains that the enumeration in A.D. 4 was incomplete.

³ Edition of *Monum. Ancyr.*, p. 37.

⁴ ἀποτιμησόμενος τὰ ἐν Συρίᾳ, *Ant. Jud.*, xvii. 13, 5.

long-lost stone, mentions that, by orders of Quirinius, governor of Syria, Q. Æmilius Secundus took the *census* of the city of Apameia in Syria, and numbered in it 170,000 citizens.¹ This was "the great census" of Judæa (see above).

The third *census*-period began in A.D. 19-20. I know nothing in the way of evidence that it was observed.

The fourth *census*-period began in A.D. 33-34. There is one very important piece of evidence as to this *census*. It is well known that nations which were not thoroughly Romanized strongly objected to the *census* as a mark of complete subjection; and Tacitus mentions that in A.D. 36 disturbances among a tribe called Kietai,² in Cilicia Tracheia, required the intervention of a Roman army from Syria, after the power of King Archelaus had proved insufficient to reduce the insurgents. He adds that the discontent of the Kietai was due to their having been compelled, as if they had been a Roman province,³ to submit to *census* and pay tribute. It is clear that an attempt had been made by Archelaus to carry out the Roman custom in his kingdom, which was a dependency of Rome (as the realm of Herod had been). There can be no doubt that he did so under orders from Rome, for no independent king would voluntarily curtail his own authority; and his action was felt by his subjects to be a step towards the Romanization of the land. They rebelled against a king so weak as to impose on them with his own hand the Roman yoke. Tacitus describes in a few words transactions which must have occupied a year or more.

¹ *Ephem. Epigraph.*, iv., p. 538.

² The reading *Clitæ*, in the ordinary texts of Tacitus, is false; the true reading is established by Wilhelm, *Arch. Epigr. Mittheil. aus Oesterr.*, 1894, p. 1 f.

³ *Nostrum in modum*. I quote the rendering of the words by Mr. Furneaux in his admirable edition. Similarly Nipperdey, "*wie die Bewohner der römischen Provinzen.*" As Archelaus was dependent on Syria, this suggests a Syrian *census*.

Archelaus was evidently ordered to carry out in his kingdom the Roman *census*, which strictly fell in the year 34; naturally this took some considerable time,¹ and we may be certain that Archelaus, besides being a feeble administrator (as we know from the general character of events at this time), would not be very eager to carry out the Roman scheme. In 35 the attempt to make *census* and valuation was going on,² and resulted in a rebellion, which, after Archelaus had vainly tried to restrain it, called for the intervention of the distant governor of Syria.

It is important to notice that, when the Roman *census* was carried out in a dependent kingdom, it was, apparently, not carried out by Roman officials, but left to the king to conduct at his own discretion and responsibility.

The fifth *census*-period began A.D. 47-48; and Tacitus mentions that the Emperor Claudius held a *census* of citizens in 48 (Tacitus, *Ann.*, xi. 25; Suet., *Claud.*, 16). The age of individual Roman citizens was recorded, according to their own statement, at this and at previous *census* (Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, vii. 48 [159]). Claudius was engaged in duties connected with this *census* at Ostia in the middle of October, 48 (Tac., *Ann.*, xi. 31).

The sixth *census*-period fell in 61-62. I know no evidence that it was observed. The seventh period fell in 75-76; but for some reason it was anticipated by two years in Rome. Vespasian and Titus held the censorship (which was an office lasting eighteen months) in 73-74,³ and made an enumeration of Roman citizens.

These facts, each slight in itself, establish, when taken together, a probability that the Egyptian *census*-periods

¹ The Egyptian *census*-declarations are regularly dated late in the year following the *census*-year.

² Tacitus mentions the *census* and the tribute as two distinct facts.

³ Beginning April, 73, according to Chambalu *de magistrat. Flaviorum* (quoted by Goyau, *Chron. de l'Emp. Rom.*, s.a.).

are not peculiar to Egypt, but frequently coincide with the taking of *census* in some other part of the empire, and that the Egyptian custom springs out of some principle of wider application. That wider principle is recorded by one historian, and one only, viz., Luke; but his evidence comes in to explain and to connect the scattered facts. In several cases the Roman historians record only the *census* of Roman citizens, and evidently with true Roman pride regarded the *census* of the subject population as beneath the dignity of historical record. Augustus himself mentions only the *census* of Roman citizens; but we have distinct evidence that the first and second *census* were held in Syria, and the fourth in the dependent kingdom of Cilicia Tracheia.

The question may be asked why Augustus in his review of his own services to the state (the *Monumentum Ancyranum*) was silent about this fact in his career (so important in our eyes). But, besides the reason stated in the previous paragraph, we find that Augustus does not include in that document any statement as to his reorganization of the provinces.¹ Further, the principle, though laid down as a "counsel of perfection," was not carried out completely; and, therefore, it could not claim a place in the record of Augustus's achievements.

We notice, further, that these *census*-periods pass naturally into the indictional periods of the fourth century. The year 327-328 began a new *census*-period, and in that year Constantinople was founded. This year was taken as the beginning of an indictional period; but whereas the old *census*-periods had occurred every fifteenth year according to the old Roman method of counting (which reckoned in the total both starting and finishing point), but every fourteenth year according to the modern way of reckoning,

¹ He mentions his colonies in Pisidia, etc., but the *coloniae*, of course, were Roman.

this year 327-328 was fifteen years (in the modern sense) later than 312, from the autumn of which year the indictional periods were considered to begin; and the indictional periods were henceforth reckoned as full fifteen years in our sense. This consideration suggests that the theory of *census*-periods lasted through the Roman Empire, however much the practice may have fallen short of the theory.

The facts which have been stated would not be in themselves strong enough to prove a theory: they are too few to exclude chance coincidence. But this is a question of the credibility of a statement made by a good historian; and when we find that the facts support his statement, then his statement is placed on a much higher plane of historical authority.

Again, those who say that Luke's statement is a mere error, are bound to give some explanation how he fell into the error. The old-fashioned explanation, as stated by Mommsen, is that Luke borrowed from Josephus and mixed up truth and falsehood in his account. But it is now generally recognised that all attempts to show that Luke was dependent on Josephus have failed; the opinion is steadily growing stronger that the Third Gospel and Acts were written earlier than Josephus's historical works; and it will in that case be necessary to admit that Luke made an independent investigation of early Christian history and the general facts of Roman history. But how could an independent investigator fall into a blunder so portentous as the supposed error, and in a point so fundamental? A historian may be guilty of a slip in a name or some such detail; but the error attributed to Luke is not a mere slip. Unless the *census* was carried out according to a non-Roman tribal system, *i.e.*, under the government of a king (compare Luke i. 5), the idea is a meaningless invention. If Luke falsely turned the great

census of 6 A.D. into an older *census*, he went on to invent a whole chapter of history, and to violate the character of Roman procedure (which must have been well known to him), in order to produce a special effect required for his narrative. To me this seems a psychological impossibility.

Reason has now been given to believe that Luke is probably right in the following points: (1) A series of *census* were taken in Syria and in Egypt; (2) the idea of taking these *census* originated from Augustus; (3) the first *census* was taken some years B.C. On the other hand, although Augustus undoubtedly recognised the administrative value of obtaining full statistics of the whole empire,¹ and though the case of Syria and Egypt shows that he also recognised the necessity of periodically revising the statistics, yet we have no evidence proving that he definitely ordered the taking of *census* in every province, whether by general edict or by a clause in the instructions (*mandata*) given to each governor. But it is not necessary to understand Luke as affirming that Augustus actually issued such an order. According to Luke's way of mentioning Roman matters,² he need not be taken as meaning more than that Augustus laid down the theoretic principle that periodical *census* ought to be made of the empire. It is highly probable both that this principle was attributed to Augustus by general opinion in the first century, and that the general opinion was right in so doing.

It is quite uncritical and unhistorical in spirit to press Luke's language to the extremest technical limit in which it is capable of being understood, and then to declare that his statement is false, because that extreme form is not true. In my *St. Paul*, p. 48 f., an example is given of the

¹ This is proved by facts often collected: *e.g.*, see Plummer, p. 48; Schürer, ii., p. 434 ff.

² See the fourth paragraph of this paper.

way in which one of Luke's statements is squeezed into an absurd meaning, and then condemned for absurdity. Obscurity envelops the whole subject, and dogmatic negatives should be avoided until more evidence is obtained. Discoveries may be made any day. W. M. RAMSAY.

(To be continued.)

HENRY DRUMMOND.

It was a tragically solemn moment on Thursday, March 11, when, as the mourners were gathering to the funeral of Professor Candlish in the Free College Church, Glasgow, a telegram arrived from Tunbridge Wells, announcing the death of his colleague, Professor Drummond.

Drummond had been ill for two years with a rheumatic affection which baffled the physicians; but the impression was that he would come out of it. He had this expectation himself as lately as the New Year; and last summer and autumn, those by whom he was visited expressed themselves very hopefully. He retained to the last his mental energy and the cheerfulness of his disposition. But the disease had worn out his bodily strength; and at last he slipped through the doctors' hands somewhat suddenly.

My recollections of him go far back; for I used often to see him, a bright-eyed little fellow in flannels, standing behind the wickets on the school cricket-field, acquiring the experience which he was subsequently to turn to good account, for the religious instruction of boys, in *Baxter's Second Innings*. We were at the University of Edinburgh at the same time, and entered the New College together.

He was a very young student, and ripened slowly. The first unmistakable sample of his quality which he gave his fellow-students was an essay, delivered, near the end of his course, before the Theological Society, on "Spiritual Diagnosis." In a single hour this performance inspired

his contemporaries with an entirely new conception of his possibilities; and it touched so high a mark that I was never afterwards surprised at anything which he achieved. The idea of the paper was that theological instruction ought to include, not only knowledge of books, but contact with men, and the diagnosis of spiritual disease, just as medical education includes a clinical as well as a theoretical course.

It turned out to be a kind of prophecy, because at the close of that session Mr. Moody came to Edinburgh on his first visit, and Drummond and many more of the divinity students became engaged in the very work which he had desiderated—dealing at close quarters with religious inquirers. That was a glorious time—a time of clear vision, pure motives, and spiritual power. The students went all over the country holding meetings, especially for young men, and the fire of revival burst out wherever they went.

It was then that Drummond unfolded the rare powers for which he subsequently became famous. I was a great deal with him at that time, and I have no hesitation in saying that in some respects he was, from the first, the best speaker I have ever heard. There was not a particle of what is usually denominated oratory; for this he was far too much in earnest. It was quiet, simple, without art; yet it was the perfection of art; for there was in it an indescribable charm, which never failed to hold the audience spell-bound from the first words to the last. He continued with Mr. Moody two years, holding meetings for young men all over the three kingdoms.¹ During this period he was in daily contact with religious inquirers of every description, and obtained an unparalleled knowledge

¹ The friendship between the two men was very touching. At first, of course, Drummond was the hero-worshipper; but in later years Mr. Moody did not come a whit behind in enthusiasm. He said to me, when I was in America, and when many of his associates were finding all kinds of fault with Drummond, "I have read everything he has yet published; and there is not a line with which I disagree."

both of the secrets of the human heart and of the infinite variety of the Spirit's modes of operation. If he kept his letters, there must be in his desk an amazing collection of human documents; for inquiring spirits wrote to him in hundreds. He probably had the privilege of leading more young men to religious decision than any other man of his day.

This continued throughout life to be his favourite work. In subsequent years he carried on meetings, session after session, in connexion with Edinburgh University, by which numberless students were influenced. And the excellence of his speaking and the charm of his personality opened doors for him to circles into which an Evangelist is rarely admitted. It will be remembered how in London, in more than one season, he held Evangelistic meetings, thronged by the most fashionable society of the land, in Grosvenor House, thus doing a work which no other man in the country could have done.

It cannot be denied that, to some extent, in recent years he lost the full confidence of some of those most interested in Evangelistic operations; because, they thought, he ignored too much the central mysteries of religion and went too far in the direction of the world. But, I believe, it was the Evangelistic instinct which was leading him all the time. He went as far as conscience would allow in order to meet the doubter and the man of the world on their own ground; and he spoke to them in a language they could understand, dwelling on the aspects of Christianity which they could relish, while he left to others the task of expounding the deeper things to those who were able to bear them.

Besides, Professor Drummond was an artist. He especially appreciated the maxim that, while in mathematics the whole is greater than the part, in art the part may be greater than the whole. He never gave his hearers or readers too much. This was shown especially

in his series of booklets — *The Greatest Thing in the World*, *Pax Vobiscum*, *The City without a Church*, etc. Great men do not stoop to write little books; but Professor Drummond had no such scruples. He was aware how seldom the average man reads a book through from beginning to end, and how delighted he is when, with less than an hour's reading, he finds himself at the end of one. Into these booklets he made no attempt to crush the whole of the Gospel, as unwise preachers attempt to do in single sermons. There is a tameness about the rounded and balanced whole of truth; the average mind is oppressed with a scheme of doctrine; it enjoys fragments of theology, in the same way as it likes selections from Browning, but dreads the entire works of that obscure poet, and enjoys single choruses of Haydn and Mendelssohn, but is bored by oratorios. In Professor Drummond's case, however, this condescension to the public taste was no trick of the populariser. It suited his own cast of mind; for he was not a logical and systematic thinker, but an intuitionist, who saw certain detached points and aspects of truth with amazing clearness, and could present them to others in the most attractive forms.

There was another reason. His extensive acquaintance with religious experience had convinced him that conversion does not always, or even generally, conform to the conventional type. In Evangelical preaching it is taken for granted that this spiritual change is marked by certain definite stages—first, the conviction of sin, then a vision of reconciliation through the death of Christ, and then an outburst of joy and testimony. But Drummond found that in hundreds of cases nothing of the sort occurs; there is infinite variety; and he ceased to attempt to force experience into such moulds. He laid down no dogmas; he demanded no testimonies; he recommended no ecclesiastical organization. Whether by evangelization of this kind as strong character is likely to be produced

as by the old method of imposing a definite creed and a definite church-connexion may be doubtful; and it may be questioned whether he himself did not suffer by living so entirely in the more elementary truths of religion and avoiding its deeper mysteries. But it is the vocation of the evangelist to operate with a few vivid and telling convictions, while he leaves to the pastor and the professor the task of more detailed and recondite instruction; and Drummond was always before everything else an evangelist.

The other great interest of his life was Science. At the University he was medallist in Geology, and at the New College, while he did not distinguish himself in the other classes, I remember him driving home with a cabful of prizes from the class of Natural Science. On this subject he became first lecturer, and then professor in the Free Church College, Glasgow; and he visited, for purposes of scientific investigation, the Rocky Mountains, Central Africa, and other distant parts of the globe.

Carrying on his evangelistic and his scientific work side by side, he was early struck with internal correspondences between them. On the objects with which the two have to deal he saw the marks of the same Divine Hand; and it seemed to him that the same laws ruled in both worlds. He followed this thought out with great eagerness, and the result was his first book—*Natural Law in the Spiritual World*.

The idea of this book was by no means a novel one. Passages in plenty might be cited, both in prose and verse, in which it has been expressed both in ancient and modern literature. But to Drummond it was new, and he took it up very seriously. He undertook to prove that there is in the two spheres not only resemblance of phenomena but identity of law. He did not, indeed, maintain that all the laws of the one sphere are reproduced in the other; he

professed only to give a few specimens; but he believed the principle to be of very wide application.

Some of his critics objected to the principle altogether, on the ground that the material of the spiritual world is so different from that of the natural that identity of law is inconceivable. But this is a mere dogma. Who can question that a law like the following, for example, adduced by Drummond, applies equally to natural and to spiritual life—Any principle which secures the safety of the individual without personal effort or the vital exercise of faculty is disastrous to character. And many other incontestable instances might easily be given. Whether all Drummond's instances could be maintained is a question of opinion. The one most contested was the analogy which he drew between conversion through the regenerating energy of the Holy Spirit and the impossibility in nature of spontaneous generation. It was held that he took an extravagant view of what is meant in Scripture by spiritual death, and attributed to the unregenerate man absolute unsusceptibility to spiritual influence. But he had no such intention, nor did the analogy require any such extravagance. Some portions of his exposition may have been unguarded; but his position was essentially Scriptural, and had behind it the whole weight of theological opinion—Augustinian, Puritan, and Evangelical.

The underlying idea of the book, of which perhaps the author himself was at the time only dimly conscious, was that religion is not merely a system of revealed truths, inaccessible to experiment, but a series of human experiences, which belong as much to the nature of things as does the stratification of rocks or the movement of planets, and call as imperatively for scientific explanation. This has been the great thought of theology at least since Schleiermacher, and it is what is behind the whole argument from experience, which is likely in future to hold the foremost place in Apologetics. Drummond's apologetic was

always honourably distinguished by this feature—that he did not appear as the champion of the exterior ramifications of religion, but conducted his readers to its very citadel.

It is curious now to know that *Natural Law in the Spiritual World* had to go begging among the publishers. The critics, too, were pretty unanimous in condemnation. But the public found out the book for themselves. Drummond was out of the country—in the depths of Africa—at the time when others were deciding its fate, and he returned to find himself famous. He used to say that he never read the book after the correction of the proofs, and he certainly outlived some of its opinions. But it will be long before such chapters as those on Reversion to Type, Parasitism and Growth, fade from the public memory.

Like every scientific man of the present age, he was fascinated with the subject of Evolution, and in his later life he conceived the gigantic project of telling the story, as a continuous whole, which had been told in portions by other scientists. His last book, *The Ascent of Man*, was the commencement of this design; but it is destined to remain a torso, as his illness came on immediately after it left the press.

On the whole he accepted Evolution; but his chief aim was to prove that there is in it a factor left out by Darwin. The evolved world, as we now see it, has not been the result, as Darwin represented, of a cruel and selfish struggle for existence, but still more of unselfish and altruistic instincts, the first beginnings of which can be traced exceedingly far back, while the perfect development of them is seen in the Cross of Christ. In fact, love is at the heart of the universe, and all history has been its revelation. I am not sufficiently acquainted with scientific works to be able to say how far this was an original idea; but certainly he gave it a prominence it had never received before, and he made it current coin.

It cannot be denied that by his scientific work, also, he

occasioned some suspicion, many finding fault with the favourable way in which he referred to Evolution. But Evolution is one of the great new objects of the intellectual world of our day, and the Church cannot get rid of it. How the new teachings are to be combined with older beliefs is a problem so difficult that latitude must be allowed to those who risk a solution, so long as they remain loyal to the things most surely believed amongst us. The great difficulty is how to account for the human consciousness of sin and to defend the Christian doctrine of redemption, if evolution, in the rigorous sense, be accepted. Professor Drummond did not reach this point, which he would have had to face in his next book; but what he did contribute will remain a permanent gain to knowledge.

I am happy to be able to quote on this subject the words of one whose opinion will carry great weight. Professor Gairdner, of Glasgow University, wrote to me immediately after Drummond's death, "The earlier book, while full of suggestive and finely expressed thought, did not convince me, or appear to me a permanent forward step in the Eirenicon between Religion and Science. The latter book has, to my mind, a far wider sweep and a much more permanent value in its marvellously lucid and at the same time profound exposition of the root principles of altruism, as evolved in the wide field of nature. Nothing that I have read on the subject of ethical theory has appeared to me to go so deep or to be so convincing as this, which makes it a fundamental part of God's universe from the beginnings, at all events, of sexual life therein."

Was Professor Drummond, however, an Evolutionist? The term has several meanings, and in some of them it might with justice be applied to him. But, in its extreme and rigorous sense, it certainly was not applicable to him when he wrote *Natural Law in the Spiritual World*; because in that book he made a great deal of the impossibility of spontaneous generation. In *The Ascent of Man*

he frequently makes use of language from which it might be inferred that he held the extremest views on the subject. But what he was really concerned with in that book was not Evolution, but the presence of altruism as one of the factors on which Evolution depends. He was in the attitude of saying to men of Science, "On your own ground I will show you that there is a spiritual side of nature which you have not been taking into account." For this reason he did not contend for the necessity of supernatural interference at the point where life or thought was introduced. But, from what I have heard him say in private, my impression is, that he never took Evolution very seriously. He esteemed it because it kindled the imagination, and had stimulated and directed research. He esteemed it most of all because it had immensely expanded our conceptions of the universe, and satisfied the craving for the unity of knowledge. But the problem, whether it is true or not, in the strict sense, did not interest him; he scarcely believed in the existence of absolute truth of this sort. Physical theories of the universe were to him merely temporary points of view, which have their day and cease to be. Evolution happens to be the providential point of view for us; and, therefore, we ought to make the most of it; but it is not final, and it is ridiculous to be fanatical either for or against it.

Professor Drummond's writings carried his fame round the world. From personal observation I can testify that in America he was, if possible, more popular even than in this country. There was a time when a new book on him and his writings was published nearly every week in Germany. He once told me that one of the strongest impulses he had ever felt was to devote his whole life to the evangelisation of Japan, so enthusiastic was the welcome he received from the educated natives of that interesting country. But behind a great reputation and a literary

success there is sometimes found only a rather small and shabby personality; the artistic gift being a kind of virtuosity without root in personal character. All who knew Professor Drummond, however, would say that, in his case, the man was greater and finer than the work. I have seldom, if ever, seen any one so Christ-like.

He was remarkable for the resoluteness with which he stuck to his own work. With such a reputation, he was asked, of course, to do hundreds of things, in which his time and strength would have been consumed. But, even when they were good things, he put them away, because they were not his things. He knew what God intended him to do; and to this he confined himself, however much disappointment it might cause to others. This was a feature of the life of Christ—He would not allow the wishes of even His nearest and dearest to interfere with His plans.¹

Another respect in which he resembled his Master was Humility. He had not much of that humility which consists in a lowly or penitential estimate of self; but he had a great deal of the humility which forgets self because the mind is habitually and intensely occupied with other subjects. His successes would have turned many a head; but he never spoke of them. He rarely even mentioned to his most intimate friends the work he was doing. He took the utmost pains, but he said nothing about it; and he had habitually the attitude of being disengaged.

¹ Drummond was by no means a book-made man; but Emerson had at one time a very great influence on him; and Emerson's most characteristic note is self-sufficiency and self-reliance, with the corollary that a man must on no account allow himself to be made a hack or drudge by yielding to the claims of others or the conventions of society. In another American writer there is a passage in the same key, which is a pen portrait of Drummond: "Is reform needed? is it through you? The greater the reform needed, the greater the personality you need to accomplish it. Do you not see how it would serve to have eyes, blood, complexion, clean and sweet? Do you not see how it would serve to have such a body and soul that, when you enter the crowd, an atmosphere of desire and command enters with you, and every one is impressed with your personality?"

One more Christlike trait was Simplicity. The world was full of bright things to him, but they were common things, which others pass by unnoticed. Religion especially appeared to him the simplest thing of all; and it was his constant endeavour to disentangle it from the envelopes which prevent its beauty from being appreciated. His own intercourse with God was so direct and constant that he was impatient of the ritual and formality of institutional religion. This sometimes led him to speak of forms of worship in words which had a tone of exaggeration. But on this subject Jesus also was paradoxical.

Much might be said of his courtesy and kindness. But there was in Henry Drummond something for which there is no name—something original and unique, something starry and serene. He was full of magnetism; young men eagerly sought his acquaintance, and in every home where he was known he was the idol of the children and the servants. His death will remind many of another man of genius, who was his intimate friend—Robert W. Barbour. In some respects they were extremely unlike, yet they had the same unselfishness, the same passion for the welfare of their fellow-creatures, the same beauty of holiness. Both have been taken away in the midst of their days—Barbour at thirty-seven, Drummond at forty-seven. Both, after a life of extraordinary brightness and usefulness, suffered long before entering into rest, that patience might have her perfect work, and that they might be perfect and entire, wanting nothing. But it is from such lives that we derive the strongest assurance of immortality; for they are an inspiration of Christ, from whose love they cannot be separated; their activity has only begun, and it is an imperative necessity to believe that it is still going on; we see in this world only a brief arc of the curve which will round elsewhere to the perfect circle.

JAMES STALKER.

GOD'S ENSIGN AT REPHIDIM.

IN reading the story of Israel's first battle after the exodus from Egypt, Bible students have found difficulties in the way of seeing its meaning. A recent writer refers to three proposed explanations of the occurrence, and then proffers a fourth, which he deems more reasonable. The first suggested explanation is that Moses, on an eminence, with uplifted hands, was exercising military command over the Israelites in directing their movements on the battlefield. A second explanation is that Moses was holding aloft the rod of God for the purpose of bringing down Heaven's help upon Israel's host, as if by a magical or mechanical agency. A third and more commonly accepted explanation is that the uplifted hands of Moses represented his intercessory prayer in behalf of God's people, even though this involves the idea that, while in his physical weakness Moses failed to thus intercede, Amalek overbore Israel in the fight, as if God were refusing aid to His people unless in the hour of Moses' prayer. The fourth explanation, advocated with ingenuity and scholarship, is that Moses on the hill above Rephidim "is to be regarded as the full embodiment of his people's power," and that "in the steadfastness of his strength was firmly rooted the people's strength."

Now is there not a reasonable view of this occurrence which is different from any one of these four views, and even more closely accordant with the letter of the text, and with the spirit of the entire narrative? Is not the uplifted rod in the hands of Moses the symbol and assurance of the presence and power of the Divine Commander, whose chosen standard, or ensign, or flag, it was, in the conflicts of Israel with the enemies of Jehovah?

God's first call to Moses to lead out the Israelites from

Egypt designated the rod in the hand of Moses as the evidence of his representing Jehovah in any conflict with the oppressors of God's people. When Moses feared that he would not be accepted as the representative of Jehovah, God asked him, "What is that in thine hand? And he said, A rod." Then God gave assurance, "Thou shalt take in thine hand this rod, wherewith thou shalt do the signs." The rod, or hooked stick, of a camel driver, or of a leader of sheep or goats, in the Sinaitic peninsula to-day, is in the same form as was the primitive symbol of authority and power in the hand of Amon, and Ra, and Osiris, and other gods pictured on the monuments of Egypt long before the days of Moses. Such a rod was not, therefore, an inappropriate symbol or standard of one who stood in the name of Jehovah over against the gods of Egypt. The Israelites and their enemies well knew its significance.

With this rod the wonders in Egypt were wrought for the release of the Israelites. By its use the waters of the Nile became blood, the dust of the earth was turned into lice, the very sun in the heavens was darkened, and all the firstborn of the Egyptians were destroyed. When the host of Pharaoh pursued the departing Israelites, and the Israelites were dismayed, Moses said to his people, "Fear ye not; stand still, and see the salvation of the Lord, which He will work for you to-day. . . . The Lord shall fight for you." Then Moses lifted up that rod, and a path was made for them through the Red Sea. Again the rod was lifted up, and the Red Sea closed over the Egyptians. Yet again the rod in the hands of Moses smote the rock at Horeb, and water gushed out for the thirsting Israelites. Would not the sight of that rod uplifted in the hands of Moses give restful confidence, after this, to his people in any emergency?

At Rephidim the Israelites were for the first time called to engage in a pitched battle with an enemy. The Amale-

kites came out against them, and they were summoned to meet the issue. "And Moses said unto Joshua, Choose us out men, and go out, fight with Amalek: to-morrow I will stand on the top of the hill *with the rod of God in mine hand.*" Joshua was to lead the host on the field; while Moses upbore the designated standard of the ever victorious Divine Commander above the field. That was the plan for the battle. All seem to have undertood it.

This was neither the first time nor the last that a standard, or a banner, or an ensign, was the centre of interest and the source of inspiration to a fighting people on a battlefield. Such was the case in the wars of ancient Babylon and Assyria, and of Egypt. It has been thus in conflicts under Alexander and Cæsar and Napoleon. It is so in the Hauran and the Jaulan, east of the Jordan, and in Mesopotamia, to-day, where the leader's standard,—a staff, with or without a distinguishing streamer,—displayed on a hill-top, animates the fighters. If it goes down, they waver or fail. At Rephidim it was not the rod itself which gave confidence to Israel, but it was the rod in the hands of Moses as the representative of the God of Israel. "And it came to pass, when Moses held up his hand (with the rod in it), that Israel prevailed: and when he let down his hand, Amalek prevailed." That was natural. Are there to-day any organized fighters on land or on sea who would not be dismayed if the flag of their commander was no longer seen flying in its place?

Of course there must be some provision for keeping that standard in the hands of Moses upborne on the hill-top until victory was won. So when "Moses' hands were heavy"—lacking strength to upbear the banner—"they took a stone, and put it under him, and he sat thereon." It is easier to hold up an ensign, or a standard, in one's hands while seated than while standing. "And Aaron and Hur stayed up his hands," while Moses upheld the rod,

“the one on the one side, and the other on the other side; and his hands were steady until the going down of the sun. And Joshua discomfited Amalek and his people with the edge of the sword.”

In order to make it clear, just how the battle was won, and just what the rod uplifted in his hand signified at Rephidim, “Moses built an altar, and called the name of it Jehovah-nissi,”—the Lord is my flag; in Jehovah’s name I battle.

H. CLAY TRUMBULL.

A NEW SECOND-CENTURY CHRISTIAN
DIALOGUE.

TRANSLATOR’S PREFACE.

[THE dialogue which is here for the first time translated and given to the public is one of the earliest documents of the Church; for it was written not many years after the destruction of Jerusalem in the year 135, and therefore belongs to the epoch of Justin Martyr, to whose dialogue with Tryphôn it bears the closest resemblance, in the attitude assumed towards the conquered Jews, in its treatment of the Messianic argument, in its Christology, and in its general tone and style. Yet it is not excerpted from that writer, but is an independent document. On the other hand, it was certainly the inspiring document of several writings which have come down to us. These are, firstly, the *Adversus Judæos* of Tertullian; secondly, the *Altercatio Simonis Judæi et Theophili Christiani*, which has been edited by Prof. Harnack, and by him ascribed in its present form to the middle of the fifth century; thirdly, the turgid and monkish dialogue published in 1671 by Acherius in his *Spicilegium*, and entitled, *Altercationes Zacchæi Christiani et Apollonii Philosophi*. This last must have been written soon after 400 A.D.; fourthly, the *ἀντιβολή Παπίσκου καὶ Φίλωνος Ἰουδαίου*, edited by A. C. McGiffert, New York, 1889. The dependence of

this Greek dialogue on our own is very marked, and by preserving the name Papiscus as that of an interlocutor it establishes a link between Ariston's dialogue and our own.

For Harnack argues with much force and acumen that the *Altercatio Simonis* was a recension of the lost dialogue between Jason and Papiscus, attributed to Ariston of Pella, and mentioned by Celsus, the second-century assailant of Christianity, by Clement, Origen, Jerome. Harnack's arguments apply with double force to this Armenian dialogue, which inserts many things which are absent in the *Altercatio Simonis*, but which ought to be in it, and omits some things which are in that *Altercatio*, but which should not be, supposing it to represent Ariston's dialogue. There is thus very good reason to suppose that in the Armenian we have recovered, in part at least, the lost dialogue of Jason and Papiscus. The intrusion of the name Athanasius as that of the Christian interlocutor need not trouble us. It was a fourth-century device for recommending to orthodox readers a much older document. Similarly, in the Latin *Altercatio* the name of another Bishop of Alexandria, Theophilus, has been substituted. It may be noticed that in the Prologues of Euthalius to the Acts and Epistles the names of the same two Patriarchs of Alexandria were substituted for the less orthodox name of Meletius, to whom they seem to have been originally inscribed. Each successive redactor of a dialogue would fill in the names as he liked; and this Armenian text gives us some reason to suppose that in the original Greek document the interlocutors were simply called a Jew and a Christian respectively. I have stated these conclusions dogmatically; but, on another occasion, I shall substantiate them at length. The Armenian version here rendered seems to have been made in the sixth or seventh century, and is in a pure and classical style. I first read part of it in a codex at Etschmiadzin in 1891; I now translate it from a text lately printed at San Lazaro, which forms part of an edition of the Armenian versions of Athanasius, which it is my privilege to assist the Mechitarists to bring out, and which will shortly appear. I hope that the publication of the Armenian in an English form has led to the finding of the original Greek text, which I believe lurks in a Greek codex of the royal

library of Vienna, *Cod. Theol. Gr.*, 248, fol. 38-48, described by Petrus Lambecius in his commentaries, vol. 5, p. 135. In this codex the piece is entitled, "Athanasius, Archbishop of Alexandria, his discourse with Zacchæus, a *Nomodidaskalus* of the Jews." This Greek text I have not yet read, but hope soon to edit. The Armenian title answers more nearly to the word *antilogia*, by which Origen describes the dialogue of Ariston, than does the *logos* of the Vienna codex. The numbers inset in my translation indicate the pages of the Armenian text.—FRED. C. CONYBEARE.]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS; OR, AN INTERCHANGE OF
ARGUMENTS BETWEEN ATHANASIUS, BISHOP OF ALEX-
ANDRIA, AND ZACCHÆUS, A JEW.

.¹

Zacchæus said: Ye Christians are in error, first and foremost, in thinking there is another God than the one only God, whereas the Scriptures do everywhere assert that there is no other God. "*Hear Israel, the Lord thy God is one Lord*";² and again, "*I am God the First, and I am after the Same; and except Myself other God there is none*";³ and again, "*Hear, my people, and I will speak unto thee, Israel, I will give testimony. There is not in thee a new-fangled God, nor shalt thou worship a strange God. For I am the Lord thy God, who brought thee out of the land of Egypt*";⁴ along with other such testimonies. In the second place, because ye call Christ God and (say that He is) passible, and [born] of a woman. This ye are not ashamed to say.

Athanasius said: Dost thou wish me first and foremost to prove to thee that in the [192] Scriptures it is written that Christ is also God; and yet there are not two Gods;

¹ These dots represent a lacuna left in the Armenian codices at the beginning of the dialogue. Cf. Harnack, *Die Altercatio Simonis*, p. 125.

² Deut. vi. 4.

³ Isa. xlv. 6.

⁴ Psa. lxxxi. 8-10.

and likewise that Christ is passible and born of a woman, and that we need not be ashamed to confess Him?

Z. Prove that God is also Christ, and yet that there are not two Gods.

A. First thou must learn that Christ is God, and then thou wilt know that there are not two Gods.

Z. Proceed.

A. I desire first to guide thee in the ancient Scriptures, and after that to lead thee on to the rest.

Z. Thou canst not demonstrate it.

A. Does not Moses¹ represent God as saying, "*Let Us make man in Our image and likeness*"? To whom dost thou suppose God Himself to have spoken?

Z. Surely Christ did not then exist, since He was born under Cæsar Augustus.

A. The Word always existed as God,² and was called Christ when united with the flesh.

Z. Whence is it clear that He was?

A. First let us find out to whom God spake, and so we shall come to know whether He [to whom He spoke] was made flesh or not.

Z. I say that it was not Christ to whom He spoke.

A. Would God say to any one at all, "*Let Us make man in Our image and likeness*"?

Z. He said it to Himself.

A. But He saith not, I will make man, but "*Let Us make.*"

Z. He spake to angels.

A. Then do you aver angels to be fellow-workers with God?

Z. And what is there odd in that?

[193] A. Why in that case He no longer created and made all things by His wisdom.

¹ Gen. i. 26.

² Cf. John i. 1.

Z. Yes, He created and made all things by His wisdom.

A. Then surely it was to that [wisdom] He said, "*Let Us make man in Our image and likeness.*"

Z. Surely the wisdom of God is not Christ?

A. Be not in a hurry; but let us inquire gently and reverently, having a good conscience.

Z. How then canst thou prove that the wisdom is Christ?

A. Thou dost allow at all that God made all things by wisdom?

Z. So is it written.

A. But if by His wisdom, then is meant His Word; as the prophet declares, saying,¹ "*By the word of the Lord the heavens were established*"?

Z. Yes, but 'tis not about Christ that He spoke.

A. Thou dost avow therefore that the Word is wisdom, to whom He said, "*Let Us make man in Our image and Our likeness*"?

Z. Yea.

A. So then in using the word "Our" He declared the personality of His hearer. For He said not in *My* image and likeness, but in *Our*.

Z. Do you mean to say that the wisdom of God was another God?

A. Another God as touching personality, but not as touching (or according to) nature.

Z. So then Christ is a Goddess.

A. Say thou God; and do not, like a Jew, suppose concerning incorporeal beings that distinctions of male and female hold good. You must hold such language about them as you would even about bodies; for thy soul is nominally called feminine, yet it is not male or female.

Z. And prove that the wisdom of God is called God, and is a distinct person.

¹ Psa. xxxiii. 6.

A. First understand—for it was proved—that it is some Power, according to the Scriptures, to which God said, “*Let Us make man in Our image and likeness.*” Next that the prophet declares this Power to be the wisdom of God, thus: “*All things didst Thou make by wisdom.*”¹ And this same Wisdom he called the Word, saying: “*By the Word of the Lord the heavens were established, and by the breath of His mouth all their powers*”². And from the fact that God is incorporeal, it is clear that He did not make the word by means of vocal organs nor yet the spirit (*lit.* breath) by means of breathing organs previously set in motion.

Z. Granted that the Wisdom,—unto which God said, “*Let Us make man in Our image and in Our likeness,*”—is some Power, yet surely the Power is not God?

A. It is to this very Power God said: “*Behold, Adam is become as one of Us.*”³

Z. Surely He said not, “*Behold, Adam is become as one of Us, God*”?

A. Let it be admitted that there is some Power unto which God is wont to speak, and that it is this Power that through Solomon saith: “*When He did prepare the heavens, I was by Him. I was along with Him adjusting, and I it was in whom He delighted.*”⁴

Z. Yet He did not say, “*I also was God.*”

A. The Word will progress in spiritual stature and wisdom.⁵

[195] Z. Prove that it is even another God.

A. Unless one first learn the letters, one cannot read the syllables. So it is needful first to write, and then only can one understand what is said and signified by the writing.

Z. Now I know that there is some Power in which God

¹ Psa. civ. 24.

² Psa. xxxiii. 6.

³ Gen. iii. 22.

⁴ Prov. viii. 30.

⁵ Cf. Luke ii. 52.

delighteth. That it is also God thou surely hast not proven.

A. When the Scripture says¹: “*The Lord God appeared to Abraham, and said, I will not hide from Abraham, My servant, that which I am about to do. Abraham shall become a great and mighty race, and in him all the nations of the earth shall be blessed. For I knew that he strictly enjoined his sons, and his household after him, to keep the paths of the Lord God, to work mercy and justice, in order that the Lord God may bring upon Abraham that which He promised unto him. And saith the Lord God, (the clamour) of Sodom and Gomorrah hath waxed before Me, and their sins have much increased. And now will I going down see whether, according to their cry which has gone up before Me, it shall be fulfilled; but if not, that I may know. And the men turned thence and came to Sodom, and Abraham was standing before the Lord. And Abraham drew near and said, ‘Thou dost not consume the just with the wicked? And shall the just man be even as the wicked? If there shall be fifty just [men] in the city; wilt Thou destroy them, and wilt Thou not spare all the places because of fifty just men, if they be therein. Do Thou not do this thing, to destroy the just with the unjust, and the just man shall be even as the unjust. Heaven forefend that it should so be with Thee, who dost judge all the earth! Surely Thou wilt not execute this judgment of Thine. And the Lord said, If there be in Sodom fifty just men in the city, I will spare all the places for their sake.’*” And thus [196] he took away five, and again five, and he reached even to the number ten. Whom then dost thou allege to have thus spoken with Abraham, very God Himself or His power?

Z. Very God Himself.

A. When next the Scripture says²: “*And the Lord rained on Sodom and on Gomorrah sulphur and fire from the Lord from heaven, and destroyed their cities and all that was*

¹ Gen. xviii. 17.

² Gen. xix. 24.

around them"—then from what Lord did the Lord God rain upon Sodom and Gomorrah sulphur and fire?

Z. It says not that the Lord God rained, but "*the Lord rained.*"

A. Rather all through the Scriptures is it written "the Lord God." Let us see together if it is not God. Is it not clear that the Lord God who rained is He that said to Lot: "*Behold, I have done honour to thy face even in this thing, not to destroy the city of which thou speakest*"? ¹

Z. Not so, but "*the Lord rained on Sodom and on Gomorrah from the Lord fire and sulphur*" means "an angel rained from the Lord God."

A. So then thou callest the angel of the Lord, Lord; but his Power thou dost not call Lord?

Z. I said that He called the angel Lord; raining from the Lord God. Surely He did not call His Power Lord?

A. We said at the beginning of our discussion that the words of Scripture, "*Wisdom wrought all things,*" prove that as it made all else, so it wrought this also. For surely it is not [apart] from all else, this raining of fire and sulphur on Sodom and Gomorrah?

Z. So, then, the Lord God rained from the Lord Wisdom?

A. Nay. This Wisdom being Lord and God, rained from the Lord God fire and sulphur.

[197] The Jew said: But it says not "from the Lord God," but "*from the Lord.*" So then Wisdom is called the Lord God, but God is called Lord only.

A. Because it is acknowledged by all that the cause and begetter of wisdom is Lord and God, therefore it predicates of Him Lord only, but in connection with wisdom it adds God, for He knew of those who disbelieved therein.

Z. So then there are two Gods.

A. Two Gods there are not, because their nature is one

¹ Gen. xix. 21.

and their will identical and one their concord. And just as you speak of a king and of a king's image, without thereby speaking of two kings, but only of one, so also there is God and God's image and wisdom, but not therefore two Gods. And again in the case of man the image is resemblant; but in the case of God [it is] by nature.

Z. Since God is God, God and the image are two Gods.

A. They are two Gods when the archetype wills one thing and the image another. But when their wills are the same and also their thoughts, and also their knowledge and nature the same, then there is one God by reason of the unchangeable essence. Wherefore Moses himself, in order to demonstrate the joint nature in character, will and essences of husband and wife, used the words "*one flesh*": "*Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother and shall follow his wife, and they twain shall be one flesh.*"¹ And in the canticle² he says: "*The horse and his rider hath He thrown into the sea,*" because of their identity of nature. Now he speaks of the horse and the rider, the more so as being bodies, in the singular; but the bodiless God and His word,—being God,—He has not called by a plural appellation.

[198] Z. Let us grant that Wisdom is also God. Surely Christ is not, and from a woman too?

A. This very Wisdom, being alone and truly God of God, because of men's lost condition, consented to appear upon earth, that in her own person she might save by the free will of the Father the races of men. And having then cleansed the Virgin Mary, she took from her flesh; that mingling with men in the flesh, she might through the same save the races of men.

Z. Thou blasphemest, fellow, when thou allegest the wisdom of God to exist in the human womb.

¹ Gen. ii. 24.

² Exod. xv. 1.

A. Be not alarmed, and I will satisfy thee out of the Scriptures, that not only did the Godhead fashion Himself a temple in the womb of Mary, but that the wisdom of God is in every woman's womb, [the wisdom] which creates and hallows men. Wherefore also she said to Jeremiah¹: “*Before I formed thee in the belly I knew thee; and before thou camest forth out of the womb, I hallowed thee.*”

Z. Yes, it fashions and creatively makes. But surely it enters not into the womb.

A. First and foremost then, does it not itself say that it fashioned the womb of woman, yea, and all the limbs of the body as well?

Z. Yes.

A. So then, if she deigned to take clay from the earth and in the beginning with her own hands to fashion this womb, and the whole of the limbs which appertain to the body, why are you shocked to hear that she made for herself a temple in the womb,—she who deigned originally to make this herself? And if she fashions it, then she fashions it being within; for the Deity is everywhere, and possesses what is within and what is without alike. And again [199] this sun which shines by day touches the bodies of the dead, and shoots his rays upon foul things and stench; yet is not hurt nor defiled, but rather the more is useful for these dead things, since it dries up their foul odour consuming it.² And dost thou think that the Deity is polluted, and dost not rather believe that it cleanses the womb and opens the doors of the matrix in all cases, like a wise architect planning, making alive, bringing to perfection?

Z. But did the wisdom of God appear on earth?

A. What wonder if so? Hear Jeremiah, who says: “*He is our God. There shall not be reckoned beside Him any other. He hath found out all the ways of wisdom, and given*

¹ i. 5.

² I have kept the want of grammatical nexus of the original.

her to Jacob His servant and to Israel her beloved. Thereafter she appeared upon earth and consorted with men.”¹

Z. 'Tis not written in Jeremiah.

A. Hast thou read the Epistle of Baruch, that thou mayest know and believe that it is so written?

Z. I know that it is written in the said Epistle, but not in Jeremiah.

A. Jeremiah, along with the Lamentations and with Baruch and the Epistle, is all written in one book, and the four are entitled the book Jeremiah.

Z. Thou hast not yet proved that the wisdom is Christ.

A. I desire to guide thee unto the words which are read, that God was declared to consort with men; and then, by leading thee on thus from the Scripture, to proceed to instruct and make thee wise.

Z. God “*appeared on earth and consorted with men*”; for from His holy temple He appeared to the prophets and patriarchs.

[200]. A. After that He is said to have “*appeared upon earth and consorted with men.*” Whence it is clear that He means after the law. Fear then to scoff, lest thou be found in the day of judgment saying, *He it was whom we aforetime turned to ridicule.*²

Z. The proof is in Scripture, and I consent.

A. First own that God was born upon earth, and that He is Emmanuel, about whom Isaiah the prophet said: “*Behold a virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and they shall call His name Emmanuel, which is being translated—God with us.*” For in that way I shall progressively convince thee that of His own free will He died for all of us.

Z. Surely every just one is not God.

A. None else was Emmanuel, none else from a virgin.

The Jew says: And canst thou persuade me that Mary, being a virgin, bore [a child]?

¹ Baruch iii. 35-37.

² Sap.

The Orthodox says : The prophet says, *Lo, a virgin, etc.*¹

Jew : Lo here a young woman is mentioned, and not a virgin.

Orthodox : But what sign is there in a young woman, a virgin being known by a man and conceiving, since God said² : “*Seek thee a sign for thyself from the depth or from the height,*” and the prophet said : “*I will not seek nor tempt the Lord.*” And therefore he adds and says : “*Surely*” [201] “*it were a small thing for you to inflict trouble on men, and how shall he inflict trouble on the Lord? Therefore the Lord Himself shall give a sign. Behold a virgin shall conceive and shall bear a son, and they shall call His name Emmanuel.*”

Was then the great sign which the Lord Himself was to give in behalf of all, was this to consist merely in a young woman conceiving from a man and bearing a son, like any other human being according to universal custom?

Jew : This was the sign that before ever the child knew how to call its father or mother, it was to take the power of Damascus and the spoil of Samaria.

A. And what child, ere it knew how to call father or mother, ever refused the evil and chose the good, and took the power of Damascus and the spoil of Samaria, save only Christ alone? For when He was laid in a manger, the magi came sent by Herod to seek Him out and scrutinise him.³ But that they did not, which Herod demanded of them. For they worshipped Him, and gave gold, frankincense and myrrh; that the saying might be fulfilled which said that ere the child knew how to call father or mother, He should take the power of Damascus and the spoil of Samaria.

Z. Were the magi Damascenes?

A. In the Scriptures they call those who are disposed in

¹ Isa. vii. 14.

² Isa. vii. 10.

³ Or “cast his horoscope.”

such and such a manner [if as] Egyptians, Egyptians, and if in the same way as Canaanites, they call them Canaanites, and by analogy Amorheans from Amorhean [vices]. Wherefore the prophet cries out against your race saying¹: *Your father was an Amorhean and your mother a Hittite.* So he called the Magi who were disposed in the same way Damascenes and Samaritans.

[202]. Z. Why, if the Christ thou speakest of was to come at all, did not the prophets openly proclaim Him to be so and so? For at present you simply, in a plagiarizing manner, produce to me testimonies sometimes of this prophet and sometimes of that, and sometimes of a third. Could not any single one of them say right out in a lucid way that the wisdom of God was about to be made flesh, and to suffer this and that or do this and that?²

Whereunto answered Athanasius,—

When so many have spoken without your believing them, how will you believe a single one when he speaks?

The Jew said: And why, then, did not all of them so speak as that none should trip (or be scandalized)?

A. How would the preaching still be a mystery, if it had been preached straight out and transparently. Or put it in another way. God knew that you are an evil race and a congregation full of lawlessness, and therefore spake these things in parables; that you might not, having heard that the heathen are to possess the inheritance of God, burn the writings rather than that the heathen should read them and be saved. For if you delivered Him up to be crucified for this reason, that He said:³ "*The vineyard shall be taken from you, and shall be given to the heathen who bring forth fruit,*" how would you not all the more have burned the writings,—you who crucified the Lord and stoned His

¹ Ezek. xvi. 3, and ep. *Tertul. adv. Marc.*, iii. 13, and Justin Mart., *Dial.* 77.

² Cf. ἀντιβολή Παπίσκου, § 11.

³ Cp. Luke xxi. 41, and *Ananst. Sin. Qu.* 139, p. 594, in Resch.

preachers! So that if it had been proclaimed outright, you would certainly have done so. For if after so many manifest signs in Egypt and wonders in the Red Sea, or after so many marvels that ensued, you still fell away to idolatry, saying to Aaron, '*make us gods,*' how is it not clear that, being endowed with such a character, you would certainly have done so?

Z. Art thou not ashamed to assert the Cross of the Lord, or of God, or of His power or wisdom?

A. I am not ashamed to assert what the prophets were not ashamed to.

Z. And canst thou prove that the prophets declared that He should be crucified?

A. Moses was the first to declare it: ¹ "*And ye shall see your life hanging before your eyes, and shall not believe in your life. At dawn thou wilt say, When will it be evening? and at eventide thou shalt say, When will it be dawn?*" "*For at the sixth hour there was darkness over all the earth until the ninth hour,*" and at the ninth hour again light appeared,² so that those who looked on said, *How has it become evening?*—that is, darkness; and again, *How has it become dawn?*—that is, light.

The Jew: Convince me from the Old Testament and the Law that He must be crucified.

A. The saying: "*Look at your life, hung up before your eyes, and ye would not believe in your life,*" belongs to the Old Testament. The words: "*And at dawn thou shalt say, How has it become evening, or how shall it be dawn?*" are likewise in the Old Testament.

Z. But that is not the Cross nor death either.

A. If Isaiah says: ³ "*Lord, who hath believed in our report?*"

¹ Deut. xxviii. 66.

² Cf. Ev. Petri, 22: "The sun shone out, and it was found to be the ninth hour."

³ Isa. liii. 1-3.

or the arm of the Lord, to whom hath it been revealed? We recounted before Him, as it were, a child, as it were a root in a dry ground. He had no form nor beauty. We saw [p. 204] Him, and His was not form nor glory; but His form was mean, humble beyond all souls of men." If again David says: ¹ "They pierced My hands and feet, and divided My raiment among themselves," how can you otherwise than understand the Cross [by these words]?

The Jew: But thou hast not so far mentioned the death.

The Orthodox: ² "A man [given over] to blows, and He knoweth how to endure sorrows. For He turned His face away, and was despised and reckoned at naught. He taketh away our sins, and because of our iniquities is tormented. And we did esteem Him [a man] for sorrows, and for wounds, and for sufferings (as from God).³ But He was wounded for our transgressions. The chastisement of our peace was in Him, and with His wounds were we healed. All we like sheep have gone astray; a man on His own road is gone astray, and the Lord delivered Him over to our transgressions, and He in His affliction openeth not His mouth. As a lamb he was led to slaughter, and as a sheep before the shearer is dumb, so He openeth not His mouth. In His humility His judgment was taken away, and His lineage who shall relate? For His life is taken away from earth, because of the sins of My people He was led unto death. And I will give the wicked in return for His burial and the great in return for His death. For He wrought no sin, nor was guile found in His mouth. And the Lord is pleased to cleanse Him from His wounds. If ye shall give the [offering] for sin, your souls shall behold seed that liveth long. And the Lord is pleased to take away from the sorrows of His soul, to show unto Him light and fashion [Him] with wisdom, to justify the Just One, who was cheerfully the servant of many, and Himself upbore their sins [p. 205]. Therefore He shall

¹ Ps. xxii. 17, 18.

² Is. liii. 3-12.

³ The Arm. version brackets these words.

inherit many, and shall divide the spoils of the strong. Because His soul was given over to death, and He was reckoned among the lawless. And He upbore the sins of many, and because of their sins He was given up."

The Jew: All that Thou hast repeated, the prophet speaks of a man.

A. When thou hearest of the arm of the Lord becoming man, thou shalt understand the power of God. For surely the Deity is not composed of members.

The Jew: Thou heardest him saying, "*A Man for blows, and He knoweth how to endure sorrows.*"

A. Thou dost seem to me not to attend carefully to what was said. Just now thou heardest him saying, "*Lord, who hath believed in our report, and the arm of the Lord to whom hath it been revealed? We recounted before Him, as it were, a child.*"

The Jew: Did the Lord's arm, which thou callest power, change and become a child?

A. It did not change, which God forbid; but it took flesh, and becoming the power in the flesh, as it were in a Temple, it became man according to the flesh, and while so remaining man it was also God according to the spirit. And as man He was brought to the slaughter, but as God He took away the sins of the world. For "*by reason of this He shall inherit many, and having overpowered the devils, He shall divide the spoil*"—taking the [property] of those who for long time had plundered mankind. "*Because His soul was given over unto death, and He was reckoned with the lawless.*" Forasmuch as He was hung between two robbers, He was reckoned as one lawless; since the law saith:¹ "*Cursed be every one who shall be hung on a tree.*"

Z. See, then, He is cursed.

[206] A. "*Therefore the evil ones shall be given in return*

¹ Deut. xxi. 23.

for His death, and the great ones for His death, for He was reckoned with the lawless."

Z. Lo, here the prophet says, "*His lineage who shall relate?*" But I can produce at once the family of Jesus, for He is Son of Joseph, and His brethren are Jacob, and Joses, and Simeon, and Judas,¹ and His mother Mary.

A. This is why the prophet said, "*His lineage who shall relate?*" For unless a man be wise, he cannot know that he is born of the Holy Spirit, and of Mary the Virgin.

The Jew: Then the Holy Spirit had intercourse with Mary instead of her husband?

A. Dost see how that wisdom is needed to enquire how to be able to understand that the Holy Spirit has not any fleshly intercourse?

Z. Thou didst say born of the Holy Spirit and of Mary.

A. Yes, but not in the way of intercourse, but of creativeness. For as the first man was from God and from earth, and not through intercourse, in the same way hear and understand that Christ was from the Holy Spirit and Mary the Virgin.

Z. Why do you call Him Christ at all, when He was never crowned nor anointed by any of the prophets?

A. Thou wast instructed out of Holy Writ that He is both said to be and is Power, and Wisdom, and Word, and [207] Arm, and Child, and Man. Next thou wilt learn that He is also at the same time Ruler, and King, and Christ, and Priest of God, and Prophet. Because He is become All in All, that He may give life to all while remaining God, and not altering His nature.

Z. How can you demonstrate it to me?

A. First, that He is King and Prince. Hear Moses writing of the [lot] of Jacob in the blessings and saying: ² "*There shall not fail a prince out of Judah and a chief from*

¹ Matt. xiii. 55.

² Gen. xlix. 10.

his loins, until there shall come [He] in whom he standeth and is preserved. And He is the expectation of the Gentiles." And mark what was the prophecy. For Jacob himself at death called his sons, saying: ¹ "Gather ye together, that I may tell unto you, sons of Jacob. Hear ye, Israel, your Lord." And when they were met together, he blessed Judah the afore-said with blessing, and Joseph, the crowned one, he made slave of Judah, saying to him: ² "Let the sons of thy father do homage to thee, for there shall not fail a king in Judah, nor a chief from his loins, until there come [He] in whom he standeth and is preserved. And He is the expectation of the Gentiles."

Z. He spoke about David, for he was destined after a time to be born of Judah.

A. Not altogether. For the rulers grew up in David. But the prophecy says that until then there should be rulers of the Jewish race, when there should come [He] in whom he remaineth, and He is the hope of the Gentiles; your David was the expectation to the Jews, but not to us Gentiles.

A. Surely you would not say that the Gentiles are called to salvation, when God called them not?

[208]. Thou hast heard in the second Psalm how David prophetically says: ³ "The Lord said unto me, thou art My son, and I this day have begotten thee. Ask of Me, and I will give thee the Gentiles for thine inheritance, and for thy kingdom all the ends of the earth."

Z. David said this about himself: "The Lord said to me, thou art My son, I have this day begotten thee." Surely not about Christ?

A. And when did David inherit the Gentiles?

Z. By the races he meant the twelve tribes of Israel.

A. And when did David get possession of all the ends of the earth?

¹ Gen. xlix. 1.

² Gen. xlix. 8.

³ Psa. ii. 7.

Z. Surely Christ did not get possession of all the ends of the earth?

A. Learn, that in all Egypt, and in Palestine, and in Phœnicia, and in Syria, and in Cilicia, and in Cappadocia, and in Pontus, and in Armenia, and in Scythia, and, in short, all over the inhabited world, we write up Christ king.

Z. And in Egypt dost thou call Christ King, when He was proclaimed away from it by God? And how can Christ in that case be from God? Or how sayest thou Son of God, who finds fault, through the prophet, with our fathers, who walked in the path of Egypt, saying: "*What hast thou to do with the path of Egypt, to drink the water of Gehon?*"¹

A. He desires us not to imitate the [209] works of Egypt, but desires their salvation, and that they should come to reverence him, like all other races. Wherefore hear the prophet Zachariah, when he says:² "*And it shall be—whosoever shall remain of all the races that are come against Jerusalem, shall go up year by year to worship the King, the Lord God Almighty, and to celebrate the feast of tabernacles. And it shall be that whosoever shall not go up of all the races of the earth to Jerusalem, to worship the King, the Lord God Almighty, then these shall multiply against those. And if the race of Egyptians come not, then shall blows befall it, which the Lord shall inflict [on] all the races which shall not go up to feast the festival of Tabernacles.*

Z. Yea; He desires the salvation now of the Egyptians and that they should go up to Jerusalem, but not that [those] should proceed to Egypt.

A. Now thou canst not show that it is in the sensible Jerusalem that he desires all to meet one another year by year. For how is it possible that those who live beside the ocean should come year by year to Jerusalem? And, granted

¹ Jer. ii. 18.

² Zach. xiv. 16.

that this were possible, they could occupy themselves with nothing else except doing that alone. Hear also the prophecy of Isaiah about worshipping God in Egypt itself; wherefore he openly prophesies, saying:¹ “*And the Lord shall be known to the Egyptians, and the Egyptians shall fear the Lord in that day, and they shall bring offerings and shall vow vows and pay them.*”

The Jew : He says not “in Egypt,” but [210] “*the Egyptians shall fear the Lord and shall bring offerings and vow vows to the Lord and pay them,*” not unto Egypt but unto Jerusalem.

A. But thou canst not prove that he says unto Jerusalem. But that I may not set thee cavilling, hear the prophet himself clearly intimating:² “*In that day there shall be five cities in Egypt, which shall speak the tongue of the Canaanites, and shall swear in the name of the Lord, and the city Sedek shall be the name of the one city. In that day there shall be an altar of him, of the Lord; and it shall be a sign for ever of the Lord in the land of Egypt. For they shall cry out to the Lord because of their oppressors; and the Lord shall send to them a man who shall save them. And the Lord shall be manifest to the Egyptians, and the Egyptians shall fear the Lord, and the Egyptians shall know the holy God in that day; and shall make offerings, and shall vow vows to the Lord, and shall pay them. And the Lord shall smite the Egyptians with mighty blows, and shall disturb their idols (lit. hand-made things) and shall heal them with healing, and they shall be turned to the Lord, and He will hear and heal them.*”

Z. Against this I can answer nothing.

A. It shall be that even in greater things thou shalt let the same cry go [from thee]; so as that thou shalt be called by the new name which is given over the earth.

Z. And is there a greater name than that which we have, being called Israelites?

¹ Isa. xix. 21.

² Isa. xix. 18.

A. Hear God again speaking by means of the prophet Isaiah.¹ “*Whoso serve Me, they shall be called by a new name which shall be blessed upon the earth.*”

[211]. Z. And what is the new name?

A. If thou shouldst be made worthy to be called a Christian, thou wilt know the new name.

F. C. CONYBEARE.

(*To be concluded.*)

¹ Isa. lxxv. 15, 16.

AUTHENTICITY OF THE EPISTLE OF ST. JAMES
DEFENDED AGAINST HARNACK AND SPITTA.

I.

Two important works have recently appeared, in which very opposite views are taken as to the date of the Epistle of St. James. One is *Die Chronologie des altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius*, brought out this year by the distinguished theologian, Adolf Harnack; the other, F. Spitta's learned and acute contribution, *Zur Geschichte und Litteratur des Urchristenthums*, vol. ii., 1896, of which 239 pages are occupied with a very careful study of the Epistle. I take them in this order because Harnack on this particular book still adheres to the old Tübingen tradition, from which he has receded in regard to many of the other documents of the New Testament, while Spitta occupies an entirely independent position. As Harnack only devotes six pages to the subject, and refers to Jülicher's *Einleitung*, 1894, as supplementing his argument, I have joined them together in the discussion which follows.

Jülicher begins (p. 129) with a general attack upon the authenticity of the Catholic Epistles. They are not really epistles at all; there is nothing personal about them; the epistolary form was simply adopted, by a stranger writing to strangers, in imitation of the widely-circulated epistles of St. Paul. This is enough to prove that they are post-Pauline, and therefore not written by any of the Apostles ("damit ist schon gesagt dass sie erst aus nach-paulinischen Zeit, also nicht wohl von Uraposteln her-rühren können"). Harnack also remarks on the fact

that St. James reads more like a homily than a letter, as casting doubt on its genuineness.

Are we to understand then that an epistle must be judged spurious if it is occupied with impersonal matter, or if it is a sermon or treatise masking under this form? If so, we must deny the genuineness of Seneca's letters to Lucilius, of the *De Arte Poetica* of Horace, of the letters to Herodotus and Menœceus, in which Epicurus summed up his philosophy; nay, even of St. Paul's circular epistle to the Churches of Asia Minor, known to us as the Epistle to the Ephesians. But if these are genuine, St. Paul was not the first person to make use of the epistolary form for didactic purposes; and if we accept the account given of the Apostolic Council¹ in the Acts, he was not even the first Jew to indite a circular letter; he was only following the example already set by the President of the Council in his circular to the Churches; as to which it has been elsewhere pointed out that the resemblances between it and the Epistle of St. James lead to the conclusion that they proceed from the same hand. Jülicher, however—I am not certain about Harnack—would probably deny that the account of the Council given in the Acts is historical. Let us assume then that St. Paul was the first Jew to write a didactic letter for general circulation, why is his example to remain unfruitful, not only till after his own death, but till the death of the last of the Apostles, say thirty years later? For this is what is required by his argument. Otherwise all the Catholic Epistles might still have been written before 60 A.D. by those whose names they bear.

I proceed now to consider the arguments offered in favour of the date 120–150 favoured by Jülicher and Harnack. Both lay stress on the low moral and religious

¹ Harnack places the Council in the year 47, and considers that St. Paul's earliest epistle was not written before 48–49.

tone implied by the language of the writer. Worldliness had reached such a pitch as can only be paralleled in the Shepherd of Hermas, with which indeed our Epistle has so much in common that both must be ascribed to the same age. Instances of this deplorable degeneracy are i. 13, in which the readers are warned against making God the Author of temptation; ii. 14, where orthodox belief is put forward as excusing lukewarmness or sin; ii. 6, where it is stated that the rich members of the Church drag their poorer brethren before the law courts and blaspheme the Holy Name by which they are called, a picture of the time which is in entire agreement with what we read in Hermas, *Sim.* viii. 4, ix. 19, etc., of the apostates and informers within the Church (*ἀποστάται καὶ βλάσφημοι εἰς τὸν κύριον καὶ προδότηι τῶν δούλων τοῦ θεοῦ*). Such a state of things, implying that Christianity was a crime punishable in the Roman courts, and that the Christian body included a number of rich men who were so indifferent to their religion as to purchase safety for themselves by informing against their brethren, and even dragging them before the tribunals, is not conceivable before the year 120 (Harnack, p. 485 f.).

Taking the last argument first, I observe that one trait in St. James's description, *αὐτοὶ ἔλκουσιν ὑμᾶς εἰς κριτήρια*, is not to be found in Hermas, and it seems very improbable that actual members of the Church, though from cowardice (*Sim.* ix. 21. 3) they might apostatize and give information against their brethren, would themselves take the lead in dragging them before the magistrate. I observe also that St. James nowhere says that these rich men were Christians; as Dr. Plummer has pointed out, the Holy Name was not called over *them*, but (*ἐφ' ὑμᾶς*) over those whom they arrested. The whole passage (ii. 2-7) is directed against the respect of persons shown in favouring the rich at the expense of the poor; this is illustrated by the supposition

of two strangers visiting the synagogue, of whom nothing is known, except that one is well-dressed, the other in shabby clothes. St. James says their hearts should have been drawn rather to the poor than to the rich, because the poor made up the bulk of the Christian community, while the rich were their persecutors. If we want a parallel to the "dragging before the tribunals," we find one ready to our hand in Acts viii. 3, where Saul, *σύρων ἄνδρας καὶ γυναῖκας*, committed them to prison. So far, I see no reason why we should not understand the words of St. James in reference to the persecution of the first Christians by Jews, especially by the rich Sadducees, as in Acts iv. 1, xiii. 50, in accordance with the warning of our Lord (Matt. x. 17).

I take now the other instances of degeneracy, which, it is said, could not have been paralleled in the Church before the time of Hermas. The first is the warning against making God accountable for temptation. I must say I am surprised at this being instanced as an extraordinary example of depravity. From the time when Adam threw the blame of his eating of the forbidden tree on "the woman whom *Thou gavest to be with me*" down to the present moment, I should have thought this the natural and almost inevitable excuse by which man, conscious of wrong-doing, endeavours to palliate his fault to himself. Whether he pleads hereditary bias, or overwhelming passion, or the force of circumstances or of companionship, all these are in the end ordained or permitted by Divine Providence. In my note on the passage I have quoted from Homer, from the Proverbs, from Philo, from St. Paul, as bearing witness to this universal tendency of fallen humanity.

Nor can I see that there is anything unprecedented or abnormal in the idea that orthodox belief is sufficient for justification. Justin tells us (*Dial.*, 370 D) this was the idea of the Jews in his day, who believed that,

“ though they were sinners, yet, if they knew God, the Lord would not impute sin to them.” Is this at all more heinous than the belief with which John the Baptist charged the Jews, that, as Abraham’s children, they stood in no need of repentance? Is it more heinous than the belief of the Pharisee that he should be justified because, unlike the publican, he fasted twice in the week, and gave tithes of all that he possessed? Is it not in fact Paul’s own description of a Jewish Christian (Rom. ii. 17–25): “ Thou art called a Jew and restest in the law and makest thy boast of God, and art confident that thou thyself art a guide of the blind, a light of them that sit in darkness . . . thou that makest thy boast of the law, through breaking the law dishonourest thou God ”? I will venture to say that the history of the Church in every age, as well as the experience of every individual Christian, attests the need of this warning of St. James against confounding orthodoxy of belief with true religion.

The view of the Mosaic law contained in the Epistle is regarded as proof that it could not have had James for its author. Thus Jülicher asks, How could the strict legalist against whom Peter did not venture to maintain his right to eat with Gentiles (“ vor dem Petrus eine Tischgemeinschaft mit Heidenchristen nicht zu vertheidigen gewagt hätte ”), have written a letter in which no mention is made of the ceremonial law, in which worship is made to consist in morality, and in which the perfect law of liberty, culminating in the royal law of love, is spoken of with enthusiasm? One who could write thus must have looked on the old law as a law of bondage. So, too, Harnack, “ Law with this writer is not the Mosaic law in its concrete character, but a sort of essence of law which he has distilled for himself ” (p. 486).

The incident referred to is not quite correctly stated. It is not James himself, but “ certain from James ” (Gal. ii.

12), whose presence had this baneful effect on Peter and the other Jews. That they did not represent the real feeling of St. James is not only probable from the fact that the responsible leaders of a party are usually less extreme than their followers, but it is also expressly stated, if we accept the account given in Acts xv. 24; for there we read that James had previously had to complain of unauthorized persons speaking in his name (*τινὲς ἐξ ἡμῶν ἐξελθόντες ἐτάραξαν ὑμᾶς λόγοις . . . λέγοντες περιτέμνεσθαι καὶ τηρεῖν τὸν νόμον, οἷς οὐ διεσπειλάμεθα*). James was certainly included in the number of those who sanctioned the conduct of St. Peter in eating with Cornelius (Acts xi. 1-3, 18), and later on (xxi. 20) we find him explaining to Paul the difficulty he had in controlling the zealots of his party, the converted Pharisees of xv. 5. There is nothing in the New Testament to suggest that he was an extreme legalist. Even tradition goes no further than to show that his own practice was ascetic: it does not state that he enforced this practice on others. When Harnack says he invented a law of his own ("ein Gesetz welches er sich destillirt hat"), he seems to me to shut his eyes to the main factor in the history. If the author was really the brother of Jesus, brought up with Him from infancy, and acknowledging Him as Messiah before His departure from earth, he must have been greatly influenced by His teaching, as indeed is abundantly shown in the Epistle. What then was Christ's teaching as to the law? I make no reference to the Fourth Gospel, as the discourses there may be supposed to be coloured by the reporter, but in the Sermon on the Mount we see the law of the letter changed to a law of the spirit. The law of love to God and man is described as the great commandment on which hang all the law and the prophets. Men are called to bear Christ's easy yoke and light burden, as opposed to those heavy burdens which the scribes, sitting in Moses' seat, lay upon men's shoulders,

and of which Peter afterwards declared that "neither our fathers nor we were able to bear them." How was it possible that the brother of the Lord should seek to reimpose such a yoke? Harnack and Jülicher write as if Christianity began with Paul. Yet even in the Old Testament the law is called perfect (Ps. xix. 7), and liberty is associated with the law (Ps. cxix. 45, "I will walk at liberty, for I seek Thy precepts"; *ib.* 32, "I will run the way of Thy commandments when Thou shalt enlarge my heart"); so when St. Paul contrasts the fleshly tables of the heart with tables of stone, he only reproduces the words of the prophet, "I will put my law in their inward parts." Nor was the idea of a law of liberty strange to the rabbinical writers or to Philo. Spitta quotes from Pirke Aboth vi. 2 (a comment on Exodus xxxii. 6), "None is free but the child of the law," and from Philo ii. 452, "ὅσοι μετὰ νόμου ζῶσιν ἐλεύθεροι."

I now proceed to the consideration of the section on Faith and Works, which is put forward as a crucial instance in favour of the late date of the Epistle. To narrow the field of discussion as much as possible, I will say at once that I agree with my opponents in holding that the resemblance between this portion of the Epistle and St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans is too great to be accidental. One of the two must have been written with reference to the other. I agree also in considering that the argument of St. James entirely fails to meet the argument of St. Paul. It is in fact quite beside it, and, if intended to meet it, rests upon a pure misconception of St. Paul's meaning. From this my opponents infer that it could not have been written by James the Just, or indeed by any contemporary of St. Paul. The identification of Paul's faith in Christ, which works by love, with the barren belief in the existence of one God, which is shared even by devils; the confusion between the works of the law, which Paul condemns, with the fruits

of faith, which he demands of every Christian—this was not possible till lapse of time had brought forgetfulness of the tyranny of the old Mosaic law, and made it possible to understand “the works of the law” to mean moral conduct. If James had written this section, he would have been rudely and ignorantly attacking Paul as guilty of heresy, but if it was written in the year 130, the author might well imagine that he was only expressing St. Paul’s own meaning in other words. Feeling sure that the great Apostle would never have encouraged the idea that a mere profession of orthodoxy could win heaven, he might naturally seek to follow his language as closely as possible in giving their due weight to faith and works (“deshalb stellte er mit möglichst nahem Anschluss an Paulus’ Worte fest, wie beide, Glaube und Werke zu ihrem Recht gelangen”). The “vain man” of v. 20 is not Paul (as Schwegler supposed, and as he must have been if James were the author), but some one who claimed St. Paul’s sanction for a religion of barren orthodoxy.

I pause here for a moment to consider the very extraordinary proceeding of the author whom Jülicher has conjured up for us. We are to suppose that he wishes to disabuse his neighbours of the notion that St. Paul would have condoned their idle and vicious lives on the ground that they were sound in their belief. If this was the author’s intention, surely he would have quoted such passages as the chapter in praise of charity, or the list of the fruits of the Spirit, or the moral precepts which abound in the Epistles, rather than flatly contradict St. Paul’s language as to the justifying power of faith. One can imagine with what just scorn Jülicher himself would have treated a makeshift theory of the kind, if it had been put forward in defence of Catholic, instead of Tübingen, tradition. But this is far from exhausting the self-contradictions involved in the supposition. Though the reason for postponing the date of the Epistle is that the misunderstanding

shown in it of St. Paul's doctrine of faith and works is inconceivable at an earlier period, yet we are now told that there was no real misunderstanding in the mind of this late author: he did not identify St. Paul's faith with the belief of devils, or his works of the law with the fruits of faith. The only person who labours under the misunderstanding is the "vain man" of *v.* 20.

The attempt to explain the section as a production of the 2nd century having failed, as I have tried to show, is it not better to look at the matter from the other side, and see whether it may not be more in accordance with the facts of the case to suppose James to have written before Paul? Neither Jülicher nor Harnack will listen to such a suggestion for a moment. The latter tells us that, with the exception of a few critics whose assertions are every day losing ground ("mehr und mehr in Vergessenheit gerathen"), all are now agreed that the Epistle does not belong to the Apostolic age. The former calls it ridiculous ("komisch") to dream of its being written in 30 or 40 A.D. Such flowers of speech need not detain us: like the anathemas of earlier times, they are the natural weapons of those who wish to strengthen a weak cause by the intimidation of adversaries. I must, however, express my regret that Harnack should have spoken in such slighting terms of men like Mangold, Spitta, Lechler, Weiss, Beyschlag, Schneckenburger, above all, of the great Neander, all of whom have given their opinion in favour of the priority of James. If Neander's great name is "passing into oblivion," I venture to think it augurs ill for the future of theological study in Germany. But let us see what further arguments are alleged against the early date of the Epistle. "A discussion on Faith and Works as the ground of Justification could not have arisen before the question had been brought into prominence by St. Paul's writings. The attempt to assign the priority to St. James springs from the wish to

leave no room for opposition between the two" (Jülicher). "The misuse of the Pauline formula is presupposed in the Epistle." "The doctrine of justification by faith and works combined belongs to the time of Clement, Hermas, and Justin; we cannot conceive that it was a mere repetition of what had existed ninety years before; diese Annahme, die uns an die seltsamste Dublette zu glauben nöthigen würde, unhaltbar ist" (Harnack). To this we may add the more general statement of Jülicher, quoted with approval by Harnack, that when we compare this Epistle with what we know of the prevailing views and interests of Apostolic Christianity, we find ourselves in an altogether different world, the world of the Roman Clements, Hermas, and Justin. The specific Christian doctrines are conspicuous by their absence; Christ is hardly mentioned, and only as the coming Judge. Moreover, its late date is shown by plain allusions to the Gospels, the Hebrews, the Epistles of Paul and 1 Peter, and it is closely connected with Hermas, though it cannot be absolutely decided which of the two borrowed from the other.

I take first Jülicher's assertion that it was the wish to get rid of the controversy between Paul and James which was father to the thought that James was the first to open the debate. This, of course, will not apply to those who hold, as I do, that we have Paul's answer to James in the Epistle to the Romans. For others the easiest way of getting rid of the controversy would have been to accept the Tübingen view, that James had nothing to do with the Epistle, which was forged in his name by a late writer. (2) The impossibility of a historical "Dublette" is a bold *a priori* assumption, to which I think few Englishmen will give their assent. We are not prepared to admit principles which would lead us to deny the existence of Elizabethan Puritanism, of the High Churchism of Andrews and Laud, of the "Latitude men" of the same century, on the ground

that we find history repeating itself in the Low Churchmen, the Tractarians, and the Broad Churchmen of the 19th century. How far more philosophical was the view of Thucydides when he magnified the importance of the lessons of history, because "the future will surely, after the course of human things, reproduce, if not the very image, yet the near resemblance of the past!" There is nothing against which the historical inquirer should be more on his guard than any *a priori* assumption in determining such a question as this: Is the character, are the contents, of the Epistle of St. James consistent with what we know of the pre-Pauline Church, of the teaching of Christ, and of contemporary Jewish opinion? I venture to think there is a correspondence so exact that, given the one side, it would have been possible to infer the other side. We will test this in the case of Faith and Works. Faith is with St. James the essential condition of effectual prayer (i. 6, v. 15), it is the essence of religion itself, so that Christianity is described as "the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ" (ii. 1); the trials of life are to prove faith (i. 3); those who are rich in faith are heirs of the kingdom (ii. 5). Just so in the Gospels: Christians are those who believe in Christ (Matt. xviii. 6; Mark ix. 42); faith in God is the condition of prayer; "all things are possible to him that believeth" (Mark ix. 23); "whatsoever things ye desire when ye pray, believe that ye have received them, and ye shall have them" (Mark xi. 24); "He did not many mighty works there because of their unbelief" (Matt. xiii. 58); "thy faith hath saved thee" (Mark v. 34). But faith, which comes from hearing, must be proved, not by words, but by deeds, if it is to produce its effect (Jas. i. 22, 25, 26; ii. 14-26). So in the Gospels: "By their fruits ye shall know them," "Whosoever heareth these sayings of Mine and doeth them, I will liken him to a wise man" (Matt. vii. 20, 24); "The Son of Man shall come in the glory of His Father, and

then He shall reward every man according to his works" (Matt. xvi. 27). The relation of faith and works as shown in James ii. 22, "Faith wrought with his works, and by works was his faith made perfect," agrees with the image of "fruits" used in Matthew vii. 20, xii. 33, and with the language of 4 Ezra, "one of the very few Jewish writings which can be attributed with any confidence to the Apostolic age,¹ cf. vii. 34: *veritas stabit et fides conualescet et opus subsequetur et merces ostendetur*; xiii. 23: *Ipse custodibit qui in periculo inciderint, qui habent operas et fidem ad fortissimum*; ix. 7: *omnis qui salvus factus fuerit et qui poterit effugere per opera sua vel per fidem in qua credidit, is relinquetur de prædictis periculis et videbit salutare meum*. In the last passage faith and works are mentioned as alternative grounds of salvation, not, as in the two other passages, as constituting together the necessary qualification, but they all show that the question of salvation by faith or works had been in debate before St. Paul wrote; cf. also vii. 24, 76-98; viii. 32-36. It is worth noting that the 7th and the 9th chapters are included in that portion of the book which Kabisch considers to have been written at Jerusalem B.C. 31.²

It was indeed impossible that, with such texts before them as Proverbs xxiv. 12 and Jeremiah xxxii. 19, in which God's judgment is declared to be according to man's works, and, on the other hand, Genesis xv. 6 and Habakkuk ii. 4, in which it is said that faith is counted for righteousness, the question of how to reconcile the opposing claims of faith and works should not be frequently discussed among the Jews. Lightfoot, *l.c.*, quotes many examples from Philo and the rabbinical writers in which the case of Abraham is cited and the saving power of faith is magnified. On the other hand the doctrine of justification by works is

¹ Lightfoot, *Galatians*, p. 161.

² James, *Texts and Studies*, vol. iii., 2, p. 89.

put forward in the most definite form in some of the passages cited above from 4 Ezra and in the *Test. Abrahæ* (James, p. 93). "After death the archangel tests men's works by fire, and if the fire burns up a man's work, the angel of judgment carries him away to the place of sinners; but if the fire does not touch his work, then he is justified, and the angel of righteousness carries him to the place of the just."

The only question that can arise is as to the first use of the phrase "justified by faith." The word *δικαιῶ* is often used, *e.g.*, in 1 Kings viii. 32, *δικαιῶσαι δίκαιον, δοῦναι αὐτῷ κατὰ τὴν δικαιοσύνην αὐτοῦ*; Ps. cxliii. 2: *οὐ δικαιοθήσεται ἐνώπιόν σου πᾶς ζῶν*; Isa. xlv. 26: *ἀπὸ κυρίου δικαιοθήσονται . . . πᾶν τὸ σπέρμα τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ*; Matt. xii. 37: *ἐκ τῶν λόγων σου δικαιοθήσῃ*, and in the passage just quoted from *Test. Abr.*; but I am not aware of any instance of the use of *δικαιοῦσθαι ἐκ πίστεως* or *ἐξ ἔργων* prior to Paul and James. It does not follow that it was therefore introduced by one of them for the first time. Both seem to use it as a familiar phrase. In any case we have no right to assume that it was borrowed by James from Paul; for, as I have shown in my *Introduction*, while the argument of James on justification bears no relation to that of Paul, the argument of Paul exactly meets that of James. It is just like the pieces of a dissected puzzle: put Paul above, and no amount of squeezing will bring them together; put Paul below and James above, and they fit into one another at once. If this is so, it is unnecessary to spend time in showing that James does not quote from the Hebrews and 1 Peter and other epistles of Paul, far less from Clement or Hermas, but all these from him. For proofs that this is so in each case, and for the principles which should determine our judgment of priority, I must refer again to my *Introduction*, chap. ii.

To my mind there is only one real difficulty in the supposition that the Epistle was written by James the Just, say, in

the year 45, and this difficulty consists in the scanty reference to our Lord. It is not easy to explain why James should have been content to refer to Job and the prophets, as examples of patience, where Peter refers to Christ. It may have been, as I have elsewhere suggested, that the facts of our Lord's life were less familiar to these early Jewish converts of the Diaspora than the Old Testament narratives, which were read to them every Sabbath day. Perhaps, too, the Epistle may have been intended to influence unconverted as well as converted Jews. In any case, I do not see that the difficulty becomes easier if we transfer the writing to a time when the Gospels were universally read. On the other hand, Spitta's hypothesis, to which I shall turn immediately, has undoubtedly the merit of removing it.

I have endeavoured to show that the Epistle is a natural product of pre-Pauline Christianity. I now turn to the other side of Harnack's "Dublette," and venture with all diffidence to ask whether the half-century or so which embraces the names of Clement, Hermas and Justin was really characterised by such a monotonous uniformity of system and doctrine as is supposed, and whether it is true that the Epistle of James is of the same colour or want of colour? It would take too long to compare together the several writings which are assigned to this period. A mere recapitulation of names taken from Harnack's Chronological Table will, I think, suffice to throw grave suspicion upon the correctness of such sweeping generalizations.¹

A.D. 90-110, *Pastoral Epistles*; 93-96, *Apocalypse of John*; 93-97, *First Epistle of Clement*; 80-110, *Gospel and Epistles of John, Aristion's Appendix to Mark*; 110-117, *Letters of Ignatius and Polycarp*; 100-130, *Jude, Preaching of Peter, Gospel of Peter*; 120-140, *James, Apocalypse of Peter*; 125 (?), *Apology of Quadratus*; 130, *Epistle of*

¹ Canonical books are marked by italics.

Barnabas; 133-140, Appearance of the Gnostics, Basilides in Alexandria, Saturnilus in Antioch, Valentinus and Cerdo in Rome; 131-160, Revised form of the Didaché; 138, Marcion in Rome; 140, Shepherd of Hermas in its present form; 138-147, Apology of Aristides; 145-160, Logia of Papias; 150-175, *Second of Peter* (Harn., p. 470); 152, Justin's Apology; 155, Death of Polycarp, Epistle of the Church at Smyrna; 155-160, Justin's Dialogue with Trypho, Carpocratian heresy; 157, Appearance of Montanus; 165, Martyrdom of Justin.

A resultant photograph intended to give the form and body of a time illustrated by such incongruous names would, I fear, leave only an undistinguishable blot. It may be worth while, however, to devote a little space to the consideration of the Shepherd of Hermas, which is generally allowed to approach more nearly than any of those mentioned above to the Epistle of James. The resemblances have been pointed out in my *Introduction*, chap. ii., and the reasons for regarding them as proving the priority of James are given there and in Dr. C. Taylor's article in the *Journal of Philology*, xviii. 297 foll. I shall endeavour here to exhibit the main differences, and shall then consider what they suggest as to the relative priority of the two books.

Hermas distinctly says that he wrote after the death of the Apostles (*Vis.* iii. 5; *Sim.* ix. 15. 6), and that the gospel had been already preached in all the world (*Sim.* viii. 3. 2; ix. 17. 4, 25. 2); he distinguishes between confessors (*Vis.* iii. 2. 5; *Sim.* viii. 3) and martyrs "who had endured scourging, crucifixion, and wild beasts for the sake of the Name" (*Vis.* iii. 2); the ransom of the servants of God from prison is mentioned among good works (*Mand.* viii. 10); fasting is insisted on (*Vis.* iii. 10. 6), it is referred to as "keeping a station" (*Sim.* v. 1), nothing should be taken on a fast day but bread and water, and what is saved

is to be given to those who are in need (*Sim.* v. 3); through cowardice some Christians are ashamed of the name of the Lord and offer sacrifice to idols (*Sim.* ix. 21); baptism is essential to salvation (*Vis.* iii. 3. 5), even the saints of the old dispensation had to be baptized before they could enter the kingdom of God, and this baptism they received from the hands of the Apostles when they visited the other world after death (*Sim.* ix. 16); it is rightly said that there is no other repentance except that remission of sins which we obtain in baptism (*Mand.* iv. 3); by special indulgence one more opportunity only is granted to the Church (*Vis.* ii. 2), but to the Gentiles repentance is possible till the last day;¹ special favour and honour are bestowed on him who does more than is commanded in works of supererogation (*Sim.* v. 2, 3; *Mand.* iv. 4); martyrs and confessors should not glory in their sufferings, but rather thank God, who has allowed them to expiate their sins by their sufferings (δοξάζειν ὀφείλετε τὸν θεόν, ὅτι ἀξίους ὑμᾶς ἡγήσατο ὁ θεὸς ἵνα πᾶσαι ὑμῶν αἰ ἁμαρτίαι ἰαθῶσιν . . . αἱ γὰρ ἁμαρτίαι ὑμῶν κατεβάρησαν, καὶ εἰ μὴ πεπόνθατε ἕνεκεν τοῦ ὀνόματος κυρίου, διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας ὑμῶν τεθνήκετε ἂν τῷ θεῷ, *Sim.* ix., 28. 5, 6). [This is explained by the words of Basilides in *Clem. Alex., Str.*, iv. p. 600: προαμαρτήσασάν φησι τὴν ψυχὴν ἐν ἐτέρῳ βίῳ τὴν κόλασιν ὑπομένειν ἐνταῦθα, τὴν μὲν ἐκλεκτὴν ἐπιτίμως διὰ μαρτυρίου, τὴν ἄλλην δὲ καθαιρομένην οἰκεία κολάσει.] The name of Christ is not mentioned, but we read that the "Son of God," who is the corner-stone and foundation of the Church, the door through which all men and angels must enter to be saved, who existed before all worlds as the Holy Spirit, became incarnate in human flesh, τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, τὸ προόν, τὸ κτίσαν πᾶσαν τὴν κτίσιν κατώκισεν ὁ θεὸς εἰς σάρκα ἣν ἠβούλετο (*Sim.* v. 5, 6, ix. 1, 12, 14). Harnack thinks that the Son of God is

¹ This strict Montanistic view is not consistently adhered to (cf. *Mand.* xii. 6; *Sim.* viii. 8).

identified with Michael, the first of the angels; see his notes on *Vis.* iii. 4. 1; *Vis.* v. 2; *Sim.* viii. 3. 3, ix. 6. Believers who have persevered to the end become angels after death (*Sim.* ix. 24, 25). Mention is made of false prophets who give responses for money and lead astray the double-minded (*Mand.* xi.), and also of false teachers (Gnostics) who profess to know everything and really know nothing (*Sim.* ix. 22): some of the deacons are charged with defrauding orphans and widows (*Sim.* ix. 26. 2).

Surely no unprejudiced person who will weigh these passages can help seeing that it must have taken many years to change the Church and the teaching of St. James into the Church and the teaching of Hermas. A long process of development must have been passed through, before the simple, practical religion of the one could have been transformed into the fanciful schematism and formalism of the other. Still more striking is the contrast of the two men: the latter an illiterate Renan of the Church's silver age, with a perpetual smirk of sex-consciousness¹ and self-consciousness; the former a greater Ambrose of the heroic age, his countenance still lit up with the glory of one who had been brought up in the same household with the Lord, and who kept and pondered the words which had fallen from His lips.

It only remains to give Harnack's views as to the integrity of the Epistle. Place it in what year he will, he finds it impossible to be satisfied. It is paradox from beginning to end. There is no system, no connexion. The use of the word *πειρασμός* in chap. i. is inconsistent with the use of *πειράζομαι* a few lines below. A portion of the Epistle reads like a true reproduction of the words of the Lord, plain, energetic, profound; another portion resembles the Hebrew prophets; another is in the best style of Greek rhetoric; another exhibits the theological con-

¹ See especially *Vis.* i. 1-8, *γελάσασά μοι λέγει, κτλ.*, *Sim.* ix. 11.

troversialist. But the most paradoxical thing of all is that, in spite of this diversity, there is still perceptible an inner unity both of thought and expression. The only explanation seems to be that it is an amalgamation of homiletical fragments originally written by a Christian teacher about 125 A.D., and put together and edited after the death of the writer, probably without any name or address. Then, at the end of the century, it occurred to some one to publish it, under the name of St. James, as an epistle addressed to the Twelve Tribes, *i.e.*, to the Church at large.

The above account of the Epistle seems to me important as showing that the Tübingen solution of the problem of the authorship is found to be inadequate even by the ablest supporter of the Tübingen theory. I have not time here to examine it in detail, but I may remark that it is vitiated by the same *a priori* method to which I called attention before. A letter is not necessarily bound together by strict logic, like a philosophical treatise. More commonly it is a loose jotting down of facts, thoughts, or feelings, which the writer thinks likely to be either interesting or useful to his correspondent. If slowly written, as this undoubtedly was, it naturally reflects the varying moods of the writer's mind. Even the Hebrew prophets are not always denunciatory; even St. Paul is not always argumentative. As to the objection founded on the use of the same word in different senses, this might easily arise from a limited vocabulary or a defect in subtilty of discrimination. In the particular instance cited objective temptation is naturally and properly expressed by the noun, subjective temptation by the verb. But the same mental characteristic is seen in the double uses of πίστις and σοφία, and in my edition (p. 202) I illustrated this by the double use of ἔρις in Hesiod and of πανουργία in Sirac. xxi. 12. The peculiarity is imitated by Hermas in his use of the word τρυφή (*Sim.* vi. 5).

J. B. MAYOR.

(To be continued.)

“THE WRATH OF THE LAMB.”

(REVELATION VI. 16.)

THE wrath here spoken of is not that of the last judgment. That is a judgment—a calm judicial decision of the mind, and therefore, as far as I know, it is never described under the metaphor of wrath. The scene here I take to be that great revolution in the affairs of men which, in the view of the seer, should come, when the kingdom of Christ shall displace the heathen nations. It has the same root as the great Messianic prophecy of the second psalm, where, after long reticence, the wrath of God at length breaks forth, and asserts against the old *régime* the sovereignty of His Anointed.

It is not the historical bearings, however, but the paradox of the passage, that I am here concerned with. The first thing which strikes us about the expression is its extreme dramatism. There is nothing so dramatic, in my opinion, as the sight of an emotion contrary to the nature. When a man who has always hid his griefs bursts into tears, when a man, like Arnold, who has always veiled his anger, gives way for once to passion, we are impressed with something like a sense of tragedy; it is a bitter day in summer; it is a storm upon a lake. Some such impression in an intensified degree rises here. “The wrath of the Lamb”; it is a conjunction of the greatest possible contrasts, a meeting of the two points not only the furthest removed in nature, but the furthest removed in human imagination. From a literary point of view, the attention of the reader is arrested by the exhibition of something which seems to alter the natural relation of objects, and to join things together which hitherto had been kept asunder.

Yet, after all, it is the philosophic and not the literary paradox that forms the main interest of this passage. The

Lamb is the type of the sacrificial Divine love. Being Divine, it is infinite. How can there be a limit to infinite love? How can we think of the love of God as interrupted even for a moment by a thing called wrath? Can we any more conceive a limit to the *love* of God than we can conceive a limit to the power of God? If you were told that there was a moment in the life of the Eternal in which He lost consciousness, you would say "Impossible!" You would feel it to be a contradiction in terms that the Eternal should lose a moment. Is it any less a contradiction that Infinite Love should lose a moment? Is it any less a contradiction to suppose that there should pass over the boundless heart of God the obscuring power of a cloud of wrath, by which the movements of that heart are restrained and bounded?

Now, strange to say, the answer comes, not from the outside, but from the expression itself. "The wrath of the Lamb"; the phrase is as peculiar as it is dramatic. Why does St. John not say "the wrath of the lion"? Remember that in St. John's view Christ has two aspects—a lamb and a lion. Why does he not simply say that Christ has here put off His lamb-like appearance and put on the appearance of a lion? Because he does not mean that. He is not speaking of the wrath of a lion, and therefore he will not depict it. The state of mind he is describing is the wrath of a lamb—a particular kind of wrath. He is considering a mode of anger which is not an interruption of love, but itself a phase of love. The wrath of the Lamb is the wrath of love itself. Instead of being a barrier to the heart, it is one of the wings by which the heart flies. It is no more an interruption to Divine love than the haze is an interruption to the heat of the morning. The wrath clouds the love; the haze clouds the morning; but both the one and the other have grown out of the very thing they obscure. They are manifestations of that which they

seem to hide. There is an anger which is incompatible with the absence of love, which could not exist unless love existed before it. There is a wrath which belongs distinctively to the Lamb, which can only have its home in the sacrificial spirit. That is the wrath which the man of Patmos sees.

Here, then, is the subject which rises before us—the difference between the wrath of the Lamb and the wrath of the lion, between the anger of love and the anger of nature. Now, it seems to me that there are three distinct points of difference between them. And first, I would observe that the wrath of the Lamb, or sacrificial spirit, differs from the wrath of the lion in being purely impersonal. The wrath of the lion says, "I, king of the forest, have received an affront; some one has presumed to do an unkindness to *me*." The wrath of the Lamb says, "An unkind thing has been done." It keeps the "me" out of the question altogether. It looks at the deed in itself. It refuses to consider the sense of personal injury as a main feature of the case. You have a son who has defied your authority, exceeded his allowance, spent his substance in riotous living. You are incensed at this act of individual disrespect. You resolve to bring him to his senses; you say, "We shall see whether he or I shall be master here." Now, that is quite a legitimate mode of anger, and quite a legitimate ground for it; but it is not the wrath of the Lamb. It is not immoral, but it is *non-moral*. It is neither good nor bad. It is simply an appetite of nature like any other appetite—like hunger, like thirst, like weariness. It neither makes a man a sinner nor a saint. But it is possible for a father in these circumstances to be filled with indignation on a different ground altogether. It is possible for him to see in his son's delinquency, not an act, but a principle. It is possible for him to feel, not that an insult has been offered to his pride,

but that an injury has been done to the universe. It is possible for him to experience, not the sense of a wounded self-love, but an anger from the fact that love itself has been violated. This is the wrath of the Lamb.

Is there any test by which a man can know whether his wrath is leonine or lamb-like? I think there is one infallible test. If at any time your blood is boiling with indignation over an injury you have received, just put to yourself one question. Would your indignation be the same if you were not a recipient but a spectator? Would you have the same sense of wrong, the same boiling of the blood, if, instead of being offered to *you*, the injury had been done to a poor creature frequenting the lanes and alleys? Are you able at such a moment, by an act of sympathetic imagination, to put yourself in the position of another, and that other one of the lowliest? Are you capable of forgetting all that is implied in that phrase, "He did it to *me*"? Then you have passed the Rubicon that divides the secular from the sacred, that separates the wrath of the lion from the wrath of the Lamb. If I am not mistaken, this is Christ's own test. "Inasmuch as ye did it unto the least of these, ye have done it unto Me." The Son of Man has reached a splendid impersonality in His judgment of the world. Though Himself at once the greatest and the most wronged of all, He refuses to measure the wrong by His own feeling of pain. He casts Himself down from the pinnacle of the temple. He throws Himself into the position of the meanest, the lowliest. He identifies Himself with the neglected hungry, the untended sick, the unsheltered stranger, the oppressed prisoner. If He says "depart from Me," it is no personal wound that stings Him; it is man's disregard of man. This is a wrath that could only have existed where sacrifice had preceded it. It was the indignation of one who had emptied himself into the life of those below. It was the anger of a spirit

that had burst the boundaries of its own individual being, and felt its heart throb with the sensation of the common pain.

I pass to a second point of difference between the wrath of love and the wrath of mere nature. And it is this: The wrath of nature must begin by tearing out pity; the wrath of love is a wrath created by pity. In the former case, our indignation is stimulated by hiding the prospective photograph—by shutting our eyes to the possible goodness which the bad man may yet attain. In the latter case, the indignation is stimulated by exactly the opposite process—by bringing out the prospective photograph, and considering what the man might be made to become. Here is a radical difference between the wrath of the lion and the wrath of the Lamb. The one is born from the drying of tears; the other is itself the product of tears. The one is produced by stamping out the old fires; the other is made by fanning them. The one comes from the extinction of endearing memories; the other arises from the increased kindling of these memories—from a sense of lost possibility and a conviction of unutilized power.

The truth is, if I understand the doctrine of the Bible, that the love of God never pauses—not even over the scene of punishment. Remember what the Bible doctrine of punishment is. It is not that God exercises vengeance on the sinner; it is, that the law exercises vengeance on its own violation. Many a father says to his children, "I am leaving the room for awhile; take care you don't go too near the fire; if you disobey, you may get burnt." Is that a threat? No; it is a warning. Suppose one of these children does disobey and does get scorched, who is the deepest sufferer? It is the father himself. That is the philosophy of Calvary, and it is a deep philosophy. Why do we call it a mystery that the Divine should share in the penalty of the sin committed by

the human? To my mind, if you start from the fatherhood of God, it is the least mysterious of all things; it is a law of nature, a doctrine of the heart. A father's judgment on a refractory child, if he be a good father, is at no time a personal matter, and therefore is at all times to himself a penalty. There is an anger which love alone can feel, which lovelessness cannot feel. As long as this wrath continues, final exclusion has not come. The time of final exclusion is the time when a man ceases to have any interest in the misdeeds of his brother, when he can say to the delinquent, "Sleep on and take your rest." There are people in this world whose worst word against us would fall harmless on your ear and mine; it would fail to waken this wrath. And why? Because we have lost all respect, all care for their opinion. They do not make us sore, because there is no love. One spark of love would make us sufferers in their sin, and therefore bring us nearer to the power of forgiving them. The wrath of the Lamb is opposed to laughter, but it is not opposed to tears.

This brings me to a third point of difference between the two kinds of wrath. They express their feeling in a different formula. The wrath of the lion says, "I must have satisfaction"; the wrath of the Lamb says, "Justice must be satisfied." There is all the difference in the world between giving me satisfaction in a quarrel and satisfying my justice in a wrong. In the one case, the party that did the injury must make the reparation; no substitute can stand in his room. But in the other case, the immediate demand is for the repair of the wrong itself. If possible, it should be borne by the delinquent; if impossible, mind and heart alike demand a substitute. In the moral world, all debts are transferable. The first instinct of moral indignation is, not to avenge, but to repair; vengeance itself is only contemplated as a social reparation. The wrath of the Lamb is always a redemptive wrath. Its first impulse

is to buy back what has been enslaved, to restore what has been wrongfully taken, to set at liberty what has been bruised. The wrath of the lion will be satisfied if he hears the delinquent is dead; the wrath of the Lamb pauses not until it learns that the delinquency itself has been wiped away.

And this renders powerfully suggestive that theological epigram which represents Christ as paying the debts of humanity. Nothing in a short compass could more completely describe the facts of the case. When the Son of Man came into this world, He found it impoverished by the unpaid debts man owed to man. He found that the blind, the deaf, the lunatic, had been left without asylums. He found that the sick had no hospitals—none at least existing for the sake of their sickness. He saw that destitute children, weak and delicate children, received no blessing from the world, had no home provided for them. He perceived that there was no refuge for the outcast, no place for repentance in the order of society. He observed, above all, that for no man was there any sin-bearer, that every soul had to carry its own moral burden into the silent land. And the Son of Man's heart boiled over with the indignation of love. He felt, as a matter of course, that He was heir to these debts. They had been accumulating for generations; every age had added to them. No man living could defray them—no combination of men. He alone had the capital, the resources; it was inevitable He should pay. In whatever other ways the sin of the world fell upon Him, and there were many, it fell upon Him here. He became heir to the indignation the debtors did not feel, to the judgment they did not deliver, to the obligations they did not discharge. His wrath was proportionate to His love—no greater, no less. It was the measure of His heart—the length, breadth, height, and depth of it; and because it was the measure of His heart, it was the measure of His debt to man.

"Upon the wicked He shall rain snares"; so writes one of the Psalmists of Israel in description of the wrath of God. It is, to my mind, one of the most felicitous descriptions in the Bible. For, I know of no symbol so suggestive of the wrath of God as the bursting of a rain-cloud. What is the bursting of a rain-cloud? It is the protest against cold—the explosion which comes from the contact with a frigid vapour. Even such is the wrath of God. It is not interrupted warmth; it is warmth resenting the attempt to interrupt it. It is love asserting itself, vindicating itself. It is the heart struggling to master limits not its own, and running over into the enemy's ground. "If a man say, I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar." Who utters these violent words? It is the apostle of love himself—the man of Patmos. The fire of his youth is still there, more intensely there; but it comes from a new source. In Samaria, it was the voice of pride; in Patmos, it is the cry of pity. The burning bush has now God in the midst of it; the wrath of the lion has become the wrath of the Lamb.

GEORGE MATHESON.

*THE ORIGINAL HEBREW OF A PORTION OF
ECCLSIASTICUS.*

WHEN the first news came of the discovery of a Hebrew fragment of the Book of Sirach,¹ it occurred, doubtless, to many others as well as to myself to suppose that it was only some mediæval re-translation possibly from a Latin text. But as soon as the fragment brought to Cambridge by Mrs. Lewis appeared in *THE EXPOSITOR* (vol. iv., pp. 6 ff.) no competent judge could any longer doubt that we had a portion of the original before us. This resulted at once from its relation to the two direct translations which have long been known—the Greek and the Syriac.² These are related to the Hebrew text as two mutually independent translations. The Hebrew is reproduced with greater accuracy now by one and now by the other, and cannot be derived directly or indirectly from either of them. Moreover, the language throughout gives the impression of an original. It is hardly to be conceived that Hebrew such as this could be written by any one at the close of the classical period or in the Middle Ages. The genuineness of the fragment is now brilliantly confirmed by the larger portion which has since come to light, and been brought to Oxford by Prof. Sayce. The two fragments are immediately consecutive. Thanks to the strenuous labours of Messrs. Cowley and Neubauer, many almost illegible passages of the Codex, which was written somewhere about A.D. 1100, have been deciphered, and thus Sir. 39. 15–49. 11 now lies before us in a Hebrew text and in a carefully edited

¹ The name of the author is, of course, properly *Jēshūā'* (Jesus) *ben Sirā*. Syriac writers often turn the unmeaning *Sirā* into *Asirā*, *i.e.* "the captive." The reason of the Greek form *Σιράχ*, *Σειράχ* with the termination *χ* is not yet cleared up.

² I signify the Greek translator or the Greek translation usually by Gr., the Syriac translator or his work by S.

form.¹ Among all the rich documentary discoveries of our time this one claims a foremost rank. In the field of the Old Testament nothing like it has happened before.

It is true that in Rabbinic literature we had already a number of passages which are derived from this book, whether with or without reference to its author. But, as is now evident, only a small proportion of these reproduce the original text with absolute or even approximate accuracy.² In particular, the diction of the most of these passages has been much altered, and has become much more Rabbinic. We could not certainly ascertain from them in what degree the old translations were verbally accurate or inaccurate. Now however we are in quite a different position for deciding this question. It is evident that the Greek translator by no means reproduces the work of his grandfather with verbal accuracy. I should not, for my part, be inclined to ascribe this to the fact that his knowledge of Hebrew was so slight. In many cases he intentionally gives a free translation; *e.g.*, when he renders יפיל ארצם, 47. 22, by διαφθαρῆ. Here and there he tries to improve upon the original. Thus he writes λαμπάς, which appears more suitable, for תנור, 48. 1. Still more distinct is ἀγάπησις σοφίας for אהבת דודים, 40.

¹ "The Original Hebrew of a Portion of Ecclesiasticus (xxxix. 15–xliv. 11), together with the Early Versions and an English Translation followed by the quotations from Ben Sira in Rabbinical Literature. Edited by A. E. Cowley, M.A., and Ad. Neubauer, M.A. With two facsimiles. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press, 1897 (pp. 41 and xlvi., 4to).

² The edition provides us with everything which the learning of the editors has been able to collect, including the pseudonymous allusions. Especially good are sections iv., viii., ix., xx., xxiii., xxviii., xl., xli. (where בַּחִיק is either a mistake or an intentional alteration of בַּחִלֵּק), liv. (where in the Greek we should read πρὸ τῆς χρείας; cf. also the Syriac), lv. These are, however, almost all quotations from Sadija, who had a manuscript of the book in his possession. Most of the other passages tell us much the same as Ben Sira; in some instances the connection is quite a slight one. In xxiv. we have two passages combined (27. 9a and 13. 16b), and xvii. consists of Proverbs 4. 8a and Sirach 11. 1a. Further, lxi. may be useful in restoring to some extent the passage 42. 9 ff.

20. In 50. 24 S shows that Simon and his posterity are in question. This has been obliterated by the Greek translator, in whose time another family, the Hasmonean, held the high-priestly office.

The writer was not wholly without Greek culture,¹ but of philological ἀκρίβεια he knew nothing. Moreover he worked, in all probability, very rapidly. With the uncertain meaning of the Hebrew script, especially in a case where it was only very scantily furnished with vowel-letters, misunderstandings of many kinds could not fail to creep in.² We may imagine how often even an educated Englishman would misunderstand Walter Scott or Dickens if their works were written in English words but in Semitic writing, and according to the true Semitic system.

S gives, no doubt, a text which in general is easily read, but his work is distinctly superficial, and follows an original which had been severely mutilated.³ But where he understood the text without difficulty, he has reproduced it for the most part *verbatim*, and, thanks to the close relationship of the two languages, he often gives a more accurate reproduction of the original than Gr. Nevertheless the wise words of the preface find abundant justification—οὐ γὰρ ἰσοδυναμεῖ αὐτὰ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἑβραϊστὶ λεγόμενα καὶ ὅταν μεταχθῆ εἰς ἑτέραν γλῶσσαν. And the editors truly remark that the inaccuracy of the Greek translation which is now made manifest “may perhaps serve as a warning to

¹ My colleague, Prof. Keil, has pointed out to me that his preface shows a knowledge of the classification and even the technical nomenclature of the schools of rhetoric. Certainly there is in his preface an effort to write an artificial Greek *à la mode*, which has, however, not been particularly successful.

² Even similar consonants have been in some cases confused, as, for example, in 44. 23b, where he read ויבוננהו, ἐπέγνω for ויבוננהו.

³ That the mutilation did not befall the Syriac itself in the first instance is shown by 41. 19 ff., where the translator makes as best he can a connected whole of the half-verses 19b and 20a, separated as they are by several clauses. The explanatory addition which follows is doubtless derived from a later hand.

those scholars who are inclined to overrate the authority of the LXX. of the Old Testament" (preface, p. ix., note 5).

The author's style is, on the whole, good Hebrew. His diligent study of the Holy Scriptures referred to in the Greek prologue reveals itself even in his diction. Naturally he has most contact with the Book of Proverbs, but not so much with the main portion of it, which consists of short independent sayings, as with the consecutive passages of admonition in the first section (1. 1-9, 18). He has made great use of Job also. Many passages remind us very specially of the later Psalms. Unfortunately, the section that has been preserved does not contain the conclusion, which displays entirely the style of the Psalms, and terminates with an actual Psalm. Bickell showed long ago that this Psalm is alphabetic¹; according to the Syriac text at least three-fourths of the original acrostic words can be easily and confidently recognised. Without entering upon the question whether the Psalter was by that time practically closed, I may at least express the opinion that at the period of this author, that is to say about B.C. 200 or a little later, Psalms were still being composed.² That the author was familiar with the Pentateuch and the whole of the "Prophets" (Joshua-Malachi) is clear from many passages in the Hebrew text, even more than in the Greek. Fortune has ordained that the very last verse which has been preserved should be the one about the Twelve (Minor) Prophets, a verse whose genuineness ought never to have been doubted, seeing that it occurs also in S. Further, especial reference is made (48. 10) to a passage in the last

¹ *Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie*, vi. 319 ff.

² It follows, of course, at least in my opinion, that many Psalms, which in the main are of a different character, are *considerably* older. Furthermore, reference to those passages in Sirach, which take the form of psalms, may serve to display the exaggeration of those who would identify the "I" of the Psalms never, or hardly ever, with the individual,—always, or almost always, with the community.

of these Twelve, Malachi (4. 5 f.).¹ I emphasize the fact that the author had carefully studied all these writings in order to anticipate the inference that the Hebrew which he wrote was at that time the *speech of the people*. On the contrary, it is extremely probable that in Palestine at that time Aramaic was already more spoken than Hebrew. It is by no means for the "common people" that the book is written; neither would they have been able to read it in any case. The author was a man highly educated after the education of his time, and one who looked down upon the *βάνανσοι* with no little contempt (cf. 38. 24 ff.). I can hardly doubt, moreover, that he was a *priest*. He brings the priesthood and the hereditary character of their office into the greatest possible prominence (*e.g.* 45. 13); he addresses the priests distinctly as his relatives (45. 25 ff.), and devotes to Aaron, the founder of the priesthood, just double the space he allots to Moses. The great eulogy on the High Priest Simon (50. 1 ff.) gives undoubtedly the impression that he stood in close personal relation with him. His deep interest in the details of the Temple worship is also to be observed. In the case of such a man an accurate use of the sacred speech is not surprising, even after it had ceased to be the speech of the people. It is true that the chapters which now lie before us contain a number of Aramaic words; but the editors justly remark concerning the style: "It stands throughout on an altogether higher level than that, for instance, of Chronicles, Ecclesiastes, or the Hebrew parts of Daniel" (Pref. p. xiii.). They might have added the book of Esther also. All these books may, of course, be somewhat later than Ecclesiasticus.²

¹ In 49. 11b, which cannot now be read in the Hebrew, the last prophet but one is used, Haggai 2. 23.

² I should not lay any weight upon the correspondence of a few words in Sir. 41. 12a with those in Ecclesiastes 8. 15. It is probably accidental.

The carefully constructed glossary contributed by Prof. Driver contains all the words which for any reason are noteworthy. Some remarks on this glossary will be found below in an appendix. The syntax of the writer is almost entirely that of pure Hebrew. It may be that he has absolutely avoided even the use of the Perfect with Vav in the sense of the simple Perfect. Of the six cases which are registered in Preface p. xiii. *note*, 48. 12*d*, being quite obscure, falls out of consideration. In some cases a slight displacement may perhaps be assumed, as וּבֵן, 44. 20*d*, for וּבֵן, and in other cases this combination might ultimately be justified from the standpoint of Old-Hebrew grammar. The author of the *Treatise on the Use of Tenses in Hebrew* is in the best position to judge of this. Aramaic particles are not employed in the book. One Aramaic construction I recognise at any rate in the use of ל as a mark of the object לְכַפִּירִים שָׁחַק וְלְרוּבִים 47. 3. Further, combinations like אֵין לֵאמֹר, 39. 34, and others which appear elsewhere in the latest documents of the Old Testament,¹ are of Aramaic origin.²

The artistic method of the book is entirely that which prevails in the Book of Proverbs. The verses consist throughout of two parallel members. Of course in many cases several of these pairs are closely combined. Whether there were originally any verses that were constructed with

Certainly the tone of Ben Sira, cheerful in spite of its seriousness, is totally distinct from the melancholy tone of the Preacher. He has no such arresting passage to show as the opening of the Preacher's address. Further, it is almost certain that the writer knew Nehemiah only as an independent document, that is, in its original form, and not in its later combination with Ezra. The whole work of Chronicles is unknown to him. Otherwise he could not have failed to notice, in accordance with his whole tendency, both Ezra and the additions to the older history made by the Chronicler,—for example, the liturgical institutions of Hezekiah. Of course we cannot deduce from this that the whole work, Ezra—Nehemiah—Chronicles, was not compiled till a later date, though this appears to me probable.

¹ Cf. Brown's *Lexicon*, s.v. אֵין, no. 5.

² Thus ; אֵין אֵין. See my *Syrische Grammatik*, § 286.

three or any other uneven number of members, is, in my opinion, doubtful. The separate members contain for the most part three words—short words, like על, את, מה, being of course not counted. But it happens by no means rarely that a member, especially the first, has four words, and again frequently that one member has only two words. Seeing that many of these deviations from the usual practice are firmly established by the concurrence of the text and the translations, all attempts to discover a stricter law of form must be hopeless.¹ We find on the one hand verse-members like the following:—

עטרת פז מעיל ומצנפת, 45. 12a ;
 כופר ונעלם ממני לקחתי, 46. 19c ;
 בגדי קדש זהב תכלת, 45. 10a ;
 ושני תולעת מעשה אורג, 45. 11a ;

and on the other hand such as

ויגישהו לערפל, 45. 5d ;
 ותמשילם בנויתך, 47. 19b ;
 ויחילו כיולדה, 48. 19b ;
 ולהנחיל את ישראל, 46. 1f.

A work in which these verse-forms appear respectively cannot have been cast into any form in which importance was attached to an equal number of accented syllables. And much less can we think of a metre constructed according to feet and quantities either here, or in the Book of Proverbs, or, as I believe, in any part of the Old Testament.

The manuscript to which our fragments belong was very carefully and clearly written. Unfortunately it has been injured in many places. Single letters and groups of letters are often missing, in many cases whole verses. In

¹ I do not mean of course to assert that the game of discovering strict rhythmical form in Hebrew will not soon be applied to the fragments of Sirach. It is, on the contrary, extremely probable.

other places the letters are now difficult to distinguish. Whatever can be read has been brought to light by the strenuous labours of the editors.¹ But even if the MS. had been uninjured, we should not have had the author's original. No one would expect that from a copy made twelve or thirteen centuries afterwards. Upon inner grounds, and upon a comparison of the translations, we are confirmed in the opinion that the text has been considerably disturbed. It is further to be noticed that the writer has inserted in the margin many variations out of another MS. These are in part better than the readings of the text; in part they are worse; often the choice is difficult. Some changes are only orthographical; some Aramaic words in the margin are only explanations of the Hebrew in the text. The variations cease at 45. 7. According to a remark in Persian on the margin, the MS. which was being compared, went only so far. Certainly we miss its help all the less in the following chapters, since the copyists, like ourselves, found the *שבה אבות עולם*, the *ὑμνος πατέρων*, which is based upon the historical books of the Old Testament, easier to understand than most of the rest of the book, and so copied it more correctly.

If, even in the canonical Hebrew books, especially in the older ones, we have to assume that many of the vowel-letters are later additions, and not always correct, the same is even more certain here. For in regard to this book which was not regarded as canonical, there are many cases of short *ä* and *ɛ* represented, according to rabbinic fashion, by *ו* and *י* respectively. For example, *ניסוי דבִּים=דובים*, *גִּסוי* (cf. Driver's table, p. xxxvi.).² It is scarcely likely

¹ I must acknowledge that I have not taken the trouble to decipher more. For what the editors, with their knowledge of palæography, have been unable to discover, I, who have almost never given attention to Hebrew MSS., could not hope to discover with certainty from the facsimile.

² Even *שִׁינת*, 40. 5d, that is, according to the later Aramaic pronunciation, *שִׁנָּה* for *שִׁנת*, "sleep," in stat. constr.

that the author himself expressed by the vowel-letters those vowels originally short in כִּפֶּר = כִּפָּר, מִיעִים = מִיעֵים, etc. And even vowels originally long were more rarely expressed than in our text. If מִעִל had appeared originally in 45. 12a, Gr. would hardly have taken it for מִעֵל, and translated it ἐπᾶνω. In 42. 24a, Gr. and S must have found שְׁנִים, which they translated δισσά, שֶׁלֶשֶׁלֶשׁ, while in our text a ם is properly inserted, שְׁנִיִּם. Thus Gr. found still perhaps אִיב in 49. 9a, and understood it wrongly as אֵיב; in our text the correct אִיב is clearly marked, the word which was read also by S.

The inconsistency in the writing of ם and ש (שׁ), which appears also in other Old Testament writings, may also be traced to later writers, although it is possible that already in our author's time שׁ was pronounced exactly like ם, and so the two signs were easily confused.

We must, further, make no mistake as to the fact that in the Book of Sirach not only the text, but also the sense itself, is often very uncertain. In course of time close study will certainly make clear many things which, to me at least, are still obscure. But I fear many passages will still remain from which we shall be able to wring a passable sense only by force. Such application of force is, of course, very usual in the exegesis of corrupted passages of the Old Testament.

In what follows I propose to offer some suggestions for the improvement of certain passages. The majority of these suggestions are tolerably obvious, and I hope that for the most part they will meet with approval. I take my stand chiefly on the translations. Once more I would expressly declare that there are many passages which I have tried in vain to emend. Doubtless I have here and there overlooked a corruption of the text. A few corrections, which appear doubtful to myself, I have held in reserve.

9a, which however properly belongs, as in Gr., to the second member (b), since the sounding of the bells answers to the "resounding," נעִיכָה, in 9c. 45. 8b, בְּכִלֵי עוֹ, σκεύεσιν ἰσχυρος, כְּכִלֵי עוֹ. 45. 10c, Gr. seems to have read אורִים ותִּמִּים. 45. 20d, in accordance with בְּמִטְבָּחֵי, perhaps מִעֲרַכְתָּ לֶחֶם חֲלָקוֹ: just as we have בְּמִטְבָּחֵי for מִעֲרַכְתָּ לֶחֶם in 2 Chronicles 13. 11. Moreover ἄρτον . . . ἡτοίμασεν (עֲרָךְ) agrees with this; לֶחֶם must be removed from 20c. 45. 25c, for כְּבוֹדוֹ without doubt לְבוֹדוֹ: preceding that perhaps נַחֲלַת מֶלֶךְ לְבָנוּ, κληρονομία βασιλέως υἱοῦ ἐξ υἱοῦ μόνου, לְבָנוּ כְּבוֹדוֹ. 46. 1c, כְּשָׂמוֹ (as 43. 8a, margin), κατὰ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ (מוֹשִׁיעַ יְהוֹשֻׁעַ) was מוֹשִׁיעַ. 46. 5d, I supply שׁ to שׁ [אלגביש]: perhaps אֲבִנֵי אֶלְגִּבִּישׁ (Ezek. 13. 11, 13). 46. 16c, following Gr. and S, בְּהֶעֱלַתּוּ, 47. 4b, חֲרַפְתָּ הָעַם, ὀνειδισμὸν ἐκ λαοῦ, חֲרַפְתָּ הָעַם. 47. 41d, יִשְׂרָאֵל for יִשְׂרָאֵל, Ἰσραήλ, [אודה] בִּי without Vav before it, as genitive to וְנִכְדָּה, cf. Appendix, below. 48. 8a, perhaps תְּשֻׁלוֹמוֹת, βασιλεῖς εἰς ἀνταπόδομα, תְּשֻׁלוֹמוֹת; the passage depends, of course, upon 2 Kings 19. 15f. 48. 10d, יַעֲקֹב instead of יִשְׂרָאֵל, in accordance with Gr. and S following Isaiah 49. 6, and consequently read earlier לְהַקִּים, καταστήσαι. 49. 5a, לְאַחֵר, ἐτέροις, לְאַחֵר, is wrongly completed to לְאַחֵר. The parallel demands the former. An antithesis to the "exaltation of horns" (47. 1) would certainly not be found in turning *backward*.

The different names of God, אֱלֹהִים, קְדוֹשׁ, etc., appear to be somewhat confused. I suppose it will be possible, by close observation, to recover to some extent the original form.

I will specify only a few of those words which are still obscure to me. In 40. 6c we have מִעֵט טַע, τεθορυβημένον: the מִעֵט may have crept in from α in the same verse. 40. 15a, for יִנְקָה (which was readily suggested to the copyist by his memory) we require an expression to signify "to

produce twigs," or the like, cf. *πληθύνει κλάδους*. 41. 19a, ור or רי, *κλοπής*. 43. 4c, *נישבת*: the word which should appear here seems to belong to *d*. 43. 6b, *משלת* [מז]: *ἀνάδειξιν*, *אָנָאָל*, are confirmed by the parallel *אות*. The wording of the following verse is quite unintelligible. 43. 22b, *פורע*: the Aramaic *עוֹרַע* or *אורע* is hardly admissible, although it would exactly accord with *ἀπαντῶσα*. 48. 12d, *ונלמד*. 49. 9b, *המכלכל כל*. 40. 26d, *מטמ*[מ] can hardly be right. What is required is a word with the sense of "helper" or "help," cf. *βοήθειαν*, *בִּזְבָּז*.

The Editors in the English translation have wisely kept close to their Hebrew text, and as a rule have accepted only a very few, and those entirely certain, emendations (among which I reckon even the elimination of *נבלי* in 43. 8c) as well as insertions which are beyond doubt. As between the text and the marginal readings they had, however, a free choice. And they have given the preference now to the one and now to the other, recording the alternative in each case in the notes. In the following cases I should differ from them by preferring the marginal or the superscribed reading: 41. 4d, *תוכחת חיים* (*Prov.* 15. 31), *ἐλεγμὸς ζωῆς*. 42. 3a, *וארח* (*וְאַרְחָ*), *ὁδοιπόρων*. 42. 15c, *בועשיו*, *τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ*, *בְּבֹשֶׁת*. 43. 8a, *כשמו*, *κατὰ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῆς*, *אִמְרָה*. 43. 9b, *עדי*, *κόσμος*. 44. 22a, *כן*, *οὕτως*. 45. 2b, *במוראים*, *ἐν φόβοις ἐχθρῶν*, *בְּבַדְבָּד*. In 40. 29c the good marginal reading *כטעמי זכר* has been overlooked (see Appendix).

I cannot accept the alteration of *לאיש אונים* into *לאין אונים* in 41. 2b. I believe that *אונים* here signifies "misery"; compare *לחם אונים* Hosea 9. 14, *בן אוני* Genesis 35. 18, *ἀνθρώπων ἐπιδομένων*, *אִלְמָ: אִלְבָּז*.

In proverbial writings of this kind one member of a verse or even a whole verse easily slips out. This has often occurred in the Greek text (*e.g.*, 39. 21b, c; 40. 19b, c), and sometimes in the Hebrew also. Thus the following

are missing: 40. 2; 40. 12; 41. 20*b*; 41. 22*b* (the verse-member here marked 20*b* and 21*a* are in reality 21*c*, 22*a*); 42. 22; 44. 12; 44. 21*c*, *d*; 46. 12*a*, and probably 12*c* also; 46. 20*d*, and 47. 16.

The Greek and Syriac translations are printed along with the text in so convenient a way that we find the corresponding texts before us at a single opening. No one will blame the editors because they have not yet set to work on a thorough examination of the text of this particular portion of Gr. It would, however, have been very satisfactory if this had been done by some other scholar at home in this field. It is precisely in England that special activity has always been devoted to the study of the Greek Bible. Swete's text, however, which has been printed without any various readings, is here of very little use. If the intention was to avoid wholly the introduction of various readings, it would have been better simply to reprint Fritzsche's text, which is, at any rate, the result of a critical estimate. Using only Fritzsche's apparatus, and what is provided by Tischendorf's edition and Nestle's additions, it is now quite possible, in many cases where the original is before us, to arrive at the original form of the Greek translation. This may be shown by the following list of better readings, in forming which I have, of course, made use also of the *Vetus Latinus* printed by the editor, and occasionally of the Ethiopian translation. I need hardly add that this list makes no claims whatever to completeness.

In 39. 18*b* we should probably read ἐλάττωσις εἰς for ὅς ἐλαττώσει τό, ל כועצור ל. 39. 23*a*, ὀργή. 39. 25*b*, [ἀγαθὰ καὶ] κακά, according to the Latin *bona et mala*, טוב ורע, כבש, כן, חסד, חסד, חסד, חסד (v.l. כבש, כן, חסד, חסד, חסד). The elimination of "good" was easily suggested. In 39. 26 καὶ γάλα καὶ μέλι, שחלב ודבש, כבש, חסד, חסד. 40. 9*b*, ἐπαγωγὰ καὶ λιμὸς καὶ σύντριμμα καὶ μίστιξ should be restored. 40. 25*b*, βουλή

for γυνή, כַּבֵּן (Hebrew wanting). 40. 30b, ὡς πῦρ, שֵׁמוֹ אֵשׁ, כִּמוֹ אֵשׁ. 41. 9a, εἰν γὰρ πληθυνθῆτε εἰς ἀπόλειαν should be restored to its place. In 42. 17 τὸ πᾶν ought perhaps to be struck out; it is wanting in the Latin. 42. 18b, διανοήθη, יִתְבֹּנֵן. 43. 4a, φουσῶν, נִפְּוֹן. 43. 8c, παρεμβολῶν, צָבָא, [צָבָא]. 43. 9b, κυρίου, אֵל (במרומי). 43. 10a, ἀγίου, אֵל (בדבר). 43. 17a, ὠδίνησεν, יִחִיל. 43. 23b, ἐν αὐτῇ νήσους, בַּתְּהוֹם אֵיִם. 43. 26a, εὐδοοὶ ὁ ἄγγελος αὐτοῦ, יִצְלַח מְלֶאךָ. 44. 3c, βουλευόντες or βουλευταί, הַיּוֹעֲצִים. 45. 24b, the reading προστατεῖν ἀγίων καὶ λαοῦ seems to correspond, at least better than the other reading, to בְּרִית שְׁלוֹם לְכָל־כָּל־קֶדֶשׁ. 45. 25b, add υἱῶ Ἰεσσαί, בֶּן־יִשׂוּי. 46. 3b, πολέμους κυρίου, מְלַחְמֹתַי. 46. 13a, add Σαμουήλ, שְׁמוּאֵל (13d). 46. 15b, ἐν ῥήματι αὐτοῦ or ἐν ῥήμασιν αὐτοῦ, בְּדַבְּרוֹ. 47. 11c, βασιλείας, מְלֻכָּת (i.e. מְלֻכָּת [מְלֻכָּת]), [מְלֻכָּת]. 47. 20d, κατασυγῆναι, אֲנַחֲתָ. 48. 17b, εἰς μέσον αὐτῆς ὕδωρ, אֵל תּוֹכַח מַיִם, אֵל תּוֹכַח מַיִם. The curious reading τὸν Γώγ must be, as A. Geiger thought, a corruption of τὸν ἀγωγόν; these words were written either in the margin or above the text as an explanation. In 48. 18c, καὶ ἐπῆρεν τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ, וַיִּטְ יָדוֹ, וַיִּטְ יָדוֹ. 49. 5a, ἔδωκε, וַיִּתֵּן. 49. 6a, ἐνεπύρισαν, וַיִּצִיתוּ. 49. 10c, παρεκάλεσαν, הִקְלִיכוּ. 49. 10a, ἐλυτρώσαντο, וַיִּשִׁיבוּהוּ.

In this section of the Book of Sirach the *Complutensian* and *Cod.* 248 often have the right reading. In any critical edition of the Greek Sirach they must be particularly taken into account. On the other hand B is just here a bad authority. It has, for example, in 43. 23b the absurd reading αὐτὴν Ἰησοῦς.

I proceed to add a few more emendations which have not, so far as I know, any MS. authority, but yet are made tolerably certain by the Hebrew text or by the Hebrew text and S. In 41. 1d, τρυφήν for τροφήν, תְּרֻפָּה; thus τρυφή in Proverbs 19. 10, and τρυφήματα in Ecclesiastes 2. 8 for תְּרֻפָּה, as תְּרֻפָּה answers in Sirach also to τρυφή

long time, as an old maid, παρακμάσθη) cf. v. 11e. On זָבַר (זָבַר) is not properly the *dos*, but the *present* made to the bride by her father. In Hebrew and in the Targums זָבַר = "to make a present," occurs apart from this passage only in Genesis 30. 20 as an explanation of the names זְבַלֹּן. But how widely it was spread among different Semitic languages is shown by proper names like זְבַרְיָה (Hebr.), זְבַרְיָה (Aram.), زَبِيد (Arab.), etc. Moreover the expression טַעֲמֵי זָבַר (40. 29c, margin), "gifted delicacies," appears to be ancient, and is probably derived from an older document. I do not accept נֹחַ = "highness," 43. 21b: pronounce rather, as it appears to me, נֹגַהּ צִמְחִים = "meadow" or properly "station with vegetation," answering to יְבוּל הָרִים in a. The superscribed הָרִים is confirmed by ὄρη. The words נִין and נִכַר, which elsewhere always stand in combination, are found separated as parallel expressions in 41. 5, and so also in 47. 22c, d, when the new verse-member d begins with נִכַר נֹחֵבִי וְנִכַר סָרָה. נִכַר means neither in 42. 11b, nor in Rabbinic, "evil odour," but "corruption," or "decay." It ought to be so taken in Job 49. 7. It is likely, however, that סָרָה is right. That signifies in Aramaic, of course, "having a bad smell," and hence simply "bad," נִיִּם קָרָה just like מִצָּחַן (cf. Payne-Smith, s.v.). فخر = فخر is very doubtful, seeming to be an old mistake in copying. But متفحش = متفحش (Jauhari, according to Ibn Sikkit) would, of course, correspond with פָּחַח. That צוּר without a feminine termination can signify "figure" either in Hebrew, Aramaic, or Arabic, is very improbable. צָנוּעַ is certainly not "humble." In Jewish Aramaic צָנוּעַ is often "prudent," in Syriac always "cunning." The former meaning suits 42. 8 as well as Micah 6. 8. תִּקַּל תִּקַּל, 47. 15, in whatever way the word may be completed, can hardly belong to the Aramaic קָלַם, "to praise," for this verb, which arose out of καλῶς, "bravo," is not likely to have been common in Palestine in B.C. 200. For נִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה I would write נִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה following מִשְׁחָוָה

Additions: גָּוֵעַ, 48. 5, "dead," I should pronounce גָּוֵעַ: גָּוֵעַ would surely mean "dying." חֹק, 43. 12 may possibly be "circle," cf.

حَاق, med. و with ي, "to seize" (frequent in the Koran), حَوَّلَ "to surround," Aghāni 7. 129. 11. But Proverbs 8. 29 בחוקו מוסדי ארץ does not belong here, for there בחוקו = בְּחֻקוֹ in 8. 27. Further, it is generally probable that in that passage we should

emend *הויג* as the editors do. *רָבָה*, as an independent word for the great Flood, I should incline to explain on the ground that the writer wrongly looked upon the ancient phrase *תְּהוֹם רַבָּה* in Amos 7. 4, etc., as a genitival combination, "the depth of the Flood," or something of the kind. 43. 17c, Gr. has probably reproduced *רִשָּׁף* exactly in the same sense the author meant by *περεια*. This is supported by the parallel *אִרְבָּה*. Whether this meaning is actually the right one, must remain undecided. It may have arisen out of a wrong conception of Job 5. 7 (cf. LXX. and Peshitto), but since LXX. in Deut. 32. 24 (like all three Targums on that passage, and like the Peshitto in Habakkuk 3. 5) translates *רִשָּׁף* by "birds," this meaning of the word is established precisely for the period to which our document belongs. The words *שֶׁהָק כִּיאֲזִנִּים* in 42. 4a I believe to have been taken by the author in a different sense from that they bear in the original passage, Isaiah 40. 15, where, it may be added, the expression is by no means so clear as is commonly supposed. Ought not *שִׁבְטִים* in 47. 21a to be interpreted as by Gr. and S, "kingdoms," the word meaning properly "sceptres"? The Twelve *שִׁבְטִים* had not, at the period of Rehoboam, fallen apart into two stocks.

Hebrew Lexicons will require from henceforward to pay attention to our fragments as surely as to the inscriptions of Mesha and of Silvam. It might perhaps be desirable that the excellent work of Brown should incorporate in the part yet to appear, this new material so far as it belongs to them. In any case it must devote to this material a comprehensive appendix.

THE SYRO-PHŒNICIAN WOMAN.

“Then Jesus went out thence, and withdrew into the parts of Tyre and Sidon. And behold, a Canaanitish woman came out from those borders, and cried, saying, Have mercy on me, O Lord, Thou son of David; my daughter is grievously vexed with a devil. But He answered her not a word. And His disciples came and besought Him, saying, Send her away; for she crieth after us. But He answered and said, I was not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel. But she came and worshipped Him, saying, Lord, help me. And He answered and said, It is not meet to take the children’s bread and cast it to the dogs. But she said, Yea, Lord: for even the dogs eat of the crumbs which fall from their masters’ table. Then Jesus answered and said unto her, O woman, great is thy faith: be it done unto thee even as thou wilt. And her daughter was healed from that hour.”—*Matt.* xv. 21–28.

MANY of us, I dare say, read this story with a certain discomfort; we have sometimes almost wished that it were not in the four Gospels. We have the feeling that there is something in it inconsistent with the graciousness of Christ. The woman rather than Christ attracts our sympathy; she attracts it by the first words she speaks. She has come to ask our Lord to relieve her daughter from one of the most terrible of calamities: but she says, “Have mercy upon *me*”; her child’s sufferings are her own. And then she is a stranger, a foreigner, a heathen. She knows with what scorn the Jews regard her race; but in the passion of her love for her child she has crossed the frontier of her own country, and she has come among the people who despise her and recoil from her. Surely our Lord will be compassionate; He will pity the distress of the mother; He will show more than His usual kindness and consideration to the foreigner. But instead of this, He first refuses to speak to her at all; then, when His disciples, who are annoyed by the persistence of the woman, ask Him to cure the child and send her away, He says that He “was not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel.” At last, when the poor woman forces herself into His presence and falls at His feet, He answers, “It is not meet to take the children’s bread and cast it to the dogs.” Surely the whole

story gives us a very different impression of our Lord from that which we receive from everything else that the Evangelists tell us about Him. It is not easy to understand at first sight how it was that to Luther the story had a special charm. And yet he seems to have delighted in it. He found in it a strong support of faith.

Perhaps, however, a moment's consideration may enable us to discover why Luther was drawn to it so strongly. To him, as to many of us, there are times when God seems to refuse all answer to our prayers. We ask and do not receive: we seek and do not find. It looks as though He were treating us roughly. When we hope, and confidently hope, for relief from trouble, He does not even speak graciously: instead of the trouble being removed from us, even consolation is denied. Yes, but—says Luther—see what faith achieves. At last the woman receives not only what she asked for, but words which have given her immortal honour: "O woman, great is thy faith; be it done unto thee even as thou wilt." But while a robust man like Luther may find this in the story, and while there is very substantial and most animating truth in this conception of it, it seems to require some further explanation. All came right at last; but did not our Lord treat the poor woman rather hardly?

I.

It is our Lord's silence to the woman, in the first instance, and what He said when at last He spoke to her, that occasion our difficulty. But perhaps I ought also to refer to what He said to the disciples.

There is no reason to suppose that they felt any compassion for this foreigner—this heathen. She was disturbing them with her loud entreaties for help. They wanted to get rid of her. "Send her away, for she crieth after us." That was hardly the temper in which to offer a prayer that

was likely to be answered. It was a prayer which expressed impatience with the poor woman, and something like resentment against her. And so it was met with the discouraging words in which our Lord declared that He was not sent to heathen people, but to the house of Israel.

During the three years of His ministry, it is plain that He was under this restraint: His own appeal was to the race which had received exceptional revelations, and which, for many centuries, had been under exceptional discipline to prepare it for His coming. The fact is apparent that our Lord's personal ministry was limited to the Jewish nation: there is very much in His teaching which shows that His larger purpose was to seek and to find the sheep of God's flock that were not of the Jewish fold; but His own immediate work was among the children of the promise. This fact, I say, is apparent, and there is no difficulty in discovering the reasons for it. His work, like ours, had its limits. My principal work lies here among the people of this city, among the people of this country. I listen to accounts of the religious and moral condition of the people of India and China, and it is my duty to do what I can *here* to send them the Christian Gospel; but it is no part of my duty to go to China or India. Other men to whom the vocation comes must do that. And there are limits and restraints upon every man's work. No one can do everything that it is desirable to get done. No one can preach the Christian gospel to everybody in every part of the world. It was the same with Christ during His earthly ministry: "I am not sent," said our Lord, "but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel"; and to that the disciples had nothing to reply. You may regard the words, if you like, as a challenge to them. Did *they* take any larger view of His ministry? Were they anxious as yet that His goodness and grace should reach the heathen nations? Had they understood what He had said at times about the wider

purposes of His love? I can imagine that if they had met the challenge and had answered that this poor woman, too, was one of God's creatures and could not be excluded from God's pity, He would have heard them with great joy, and the honour which He gave to the woman would have been given to them. But they said nothing.

II.

Now let us turn to the way in which He met the distress and the appeal of the woman herself.

First, He was silent. The story gives me the impression that He was thinking of those limitations of His ministry about which I have just spoken. Should He break through them? His heart was touched: was He free to yield to the impulse of compassion? The reasons which restrained His ministry to the Jewish people were strong: was this a case in which He might disregard them? He had not crossed the frontier and gone among the heathen: might He listen to the cry of the heathen woman who had come to Him? The case, however, was not like that of the centurion's servant at Capernaum. The centurion, no doubt, was a Gentile; but he had built a synagogue for the Jews, and must have had faith in the true God even if he was not formally a Proselyte; and the elders—the Jewish authorities—came and asked our Lord to work the miracle.

There were no Jewish elders appealing to Him for this poor heathen: even His disciples, who asked Him to cure her daughter, wanted only to be relieved of the annoyance she was giving them by her cries. His heart was moved: was the case one in which He might go beyond the usual limits of His ministry? He was silent. He would not dismiss her at once, nor would He answer at once.

The delay may have been occasioned by another reason. There were limitations which restrained His ministry to the Jewish people, but the limitations might be passed

if sufficient reason was given for passing them. Such a reason might be found in the vigour of the woman's faith in Him. All mere external arrangements and methods must give way to the higher laws and ends of the Divine kingdom. It was an excellent rule to rest on the Sabbath: but the Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath; and, therefore, if it was a question of healing a sick man on the Sabbath day, the law of Sabbath rest was set aside. There were strong reasons why our Lord's ministry should be limited to the Jews: but if a heathen showed real and vigorous faith in Him, the limits must be broken through. By our Lord's silence He gave the woman her chance. When He healed her daughter, He asserted the great law that all distinctions between Jew and Gentile, however strong may have been the reasons for them, are but of secondary importance, and are merely temporary, and are cancelled by the power of faith. The woman's faith was a decisive force; it was an adequate ground for disregarding the limits by which our Lord's ministry was confined to the Jews. *Our* faith may sometimes be the reason which allows God to give us what He would not give in the absence of faith.

But I think that there was another reason why He was silent; and this third reason, for which I am indebted to Dr. Edersheim, gives a wholly different character to what He said to her afterwards.

The woman called Him the "Son of David": what did that mean on her lips? It was the expression of her belief that He was the Messiah who was to come to the Jews, and she knew the kind of Messiah they were expecting. He was to be a King who would raise the Jewish nation to a greatness surpassing that of imperial Rome,—who would give to the Jews wealth, splendour, and all earthly glory,—who would make them the masters of the world. She was a heathen; as a Syro-Phœnician, she belonged to

a race which the Jews regarded with special hatred and contempt. For her and her countrymen, according to the common expectation, the coming of the Jewish Messiah would bring only a change of masters; they would be the servants and slaves of the Jews, instead of being the subjects of the Romans; Jerusalem, instead of Rome, would rule them. She shared, no doubt, the traditional popular conceptions of what the Jewish Messiah was to be, and of what was to be the destiny of her own people when He set up His kingdom. What she had heard of Jesus of Nazareth made her hope that, perhaps, He would be gracious enough to cure her daughter; but that she and other heathen people were to be at all the better for the new power and supremacy that were coming to the Jews, did not enter her thoughts.

Christ descends to her own ground that He may raise her from it. It is as if He had said, "You call Me the Son of David, and ask Me to cure your daughter, but what part have you in the Son of David? If I am nothing more, why do you come to Me? You suppose that I am about to give to the Jews all the riches and glory of this world, and that you, as a heathen, have nothing to hope for in My kingdom. That is what you mean by calling Me the Son of David. You really renounce your part in Me when you call Me by that name. And if your thoughts about Me are true, I have nothing for you: 'It is not meet to take the children's bread and throw it unto the dogs.'"

Christ gives a vivid expression of the woman's conception of herself and her people in relation to that Jewish kingdom which she supposes He had come to establish. But there is a touch of infinite beauty and graciousness in the expression, which it is easy for us to miss. The word He uses for "dogs" is not the word which was used for the wild creatures which go about in troops in Eastern cities, and which were regarded by the Jews with great disgust. It is

the word for "little dogs," living in the house and with the family, and lying under the table at meals. The woman springs to it. Even the little dogs under the master's table are fed with pieces of the children's loaf. They are not outside. They, too, have a place in the family. If Christ puts it so, then she and her people have a place, though a humble one, in the house of the Master of all. The children may be fed first; but they, too, are to be remembered and blessed. Christ gave her a better place in the house than she hoped for; indeed, she supposed that she had no place at all. To have told her at once what He told the woman of Samaria—that Jerusalem had lost its sanctity, or was about to lose it—might not have been intelligible to her. He told her enough to give joyous vigour to her faith. She was in the same house as the children; she, too, might hope for a blessing.

III.

There are two considerations suggested by the story that it may be worth our while to think of:—

1. We should be in no haste to say that God has refused to listen to our prayers. Why the answer does not reach us at once, or apparently reach us at once, we may be unable to imagine. In the case of the Syro-Phœnician woman, the answer may have been delayed by the limitations which restrained the ministry of our Lord to the Jewish race. In our case, the answer may be delayed by the settled methods of the Divine action, in the goodness and wisdom of which it becomes us to have unhesitating faith. But in our case, as in hers, the answer may be delayed in order that we may be brought to truer thoughts concerning God and our relations to Him; and as our whole life rests upon our grasping the substantial truth of these relations, delay in securing a particular blessing may well be accepted if it is the means by which we are brought nearer to a right state of mind in relation to God. While

the particular gift is withheld, God is preparing us much larger proofs of His goodness.

2. It is no proof of the strength of our faith that we see that the answers to our prayers come at once; it is no proof of the weakness of our faith that the answers are for a time withheld. Indeed, I suppose that God often listens first to those whose faith in Him is weakest. He will not break the bruised reed nor quench the smoking flax. There are Christian people whose faith is so weak that it would bear no strain: if God did not give some answer to their prayers at once, their faith would perish, and they would cease to pray altogether. The great things, no doubt, come in answer to great faith; but answers are given at once to prayers for inferior blessings in order to keep faith alive.

But where faith is strong enough to endure the discipline, answers to prayer may be withheld for a long time; answers in the form in which they are desired may be withheld altogether. And so when good people tell me, as they do sometimes, that God has answered their prayers wonderfully for many small things, I do not at once suppose that their faith is unusually vigorous; I am rather inclined to think that as yet it is so weak that it requires constant supports, and supports of a visible kind. As it grows stronger these will become unnecessary. And when they say that they pray for great things and the answer does not come, I do not at once conclude that their faith is at fault, or that they are asking amiss; it may be so, but it may also be that their faith has the element of endurance in it. The rough winds which lay the wheat on the ground and destroy frail flowers make the oak more robust, and its strength is proved by its victory over them.

And so the delays which would ruin a weak faith perfect a strong faith; and when the grace, long withheld but persistently sought, is conferred at last, there comes with it, as there came to this poor woman, the joyous approbation of God.

R. W. DALE.

THE OUTSIDE AND THE INSIDE OF THE CUP.

NOTE ON ST. LUKE XI. 39-41.

A.V.—“And the Lord said unto him, Now do ye Pharisees make clean the outside of the cup and the platter, but your inward part is full of ravening and wickedness. Ye fools, did not He that made that which is without make that which is within also? But rather give alms of such things as ye have; and, behold, all things are clean unto you.”

R.V., v. 41.—“Howbeit, give for alms those things which are within; and, behold, all things are clean unto you.”

THE above verses have long been a cause of perplexity to the careful reader of St. Luke's Gospel both in the original and in the English version. Our Lord is contrasting the care and attention which the Pharisees bestow on externals with their negligence in things inward and vital—“Ye fools, did not He that made that which is without make that which is within also? Cannot He see the foul *inside* as well as the outside defilement?”

The conclusion we should expect is: “Make clean the *inside* as well, and then *all* is clean; but instead we have “But rather give alms (!) of such things as ye have; and, behold,” etc.

The crux of the passage for translators and commentators appears to lie in the words τὰ ἐνόντα in v. 41, which are explained variously. (See Dean Farrar's note *in loco* Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools for a brief summary of their various renderings. He remarks himself, Perhaps we may render “As for that which is within you, give alms.”) But no one seems to suspect the text of being corrupt or interpolated.

Before considering particular words let us see what is the *sentiment* which the passage, as rendered in A.V. and R.V., seems to attribute to our Lord. It is this: that wealth gained by “extortion and villiany,” ἀρπαγῆς καὶ πονηρίας, may be purified, compounded for, as it were, by giving a *part* in alms. If we take the vague rendering of

the R.V., "Give for alms those things which are within," to mean "Give *all* your wickedly acquired earnings to the poor," the sentiment thus extracted is hardly improved. Our Lord is not addressing actual or would-be disciples, men who were "not far from the kingdom of heaven," but hypocrites, men "full of extortion and wickedness," and this rendering makes Him tell the extortioner that he can salve all his misdeeds by giving his ill-gotten gains to the poor. What *right* would the extortioner have so to do? His duty would be to make *restitution* fourfold to the wronged, and also to make himself amenable to the human laws which he had transgressed.

The whole sentiment seems in flat contradiction to the spirit of our Lord's teaching. Let us then, in order to reach a solution of the difficulty, compare this passage with the corresponding one in St. Matthew, ch. xxiii. v. 25 sqq. : οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, γραμματεῖς καὶ Φαρισαῖοι, ὑποκριταὶ, ὅτι καθαρίζετε τὸ ἔξωθεν τοῦ ποτηρίου καὶ τῆς παροψίδος, ἔσωθεν δὲ γέμουσιν ἐξ ἀρπαγῆς καὶ ἀκρασίας. Φαρισαῖε τυφλὲ, καθάρισον πρῶτον τὸ ἐντὸς τοῦ ποτηρίου ἵνα γένηται καὶ τὸ ἐκτὸς αὐτοῦ καθαρὸν (= St. Luke's πάντα καθαρὰ).

All the commentators have noticed the resemblance between the two passages, but hardly sufficient attention has, it seems to me, been drawn to the *closeness* of that resemblance.

The passage as given by St. Matthew is almost verbally identical with that in St. Luke, beginning *Nûn ὑμεῖς οἱ Φαρισαῖοι* (v. 39) up to the words *πλὴν τὰ ἐνόνητα*, when the phrase, *δότε ἐλεημοσύνην*, so much out of keeping with the remainder of the verse, comes in.

How is this intrusive phrase to be explained or accounted for?

In every other point the passages match phrase by phrase, and almost word by word.

We have the verb "purify" twice in the passage from

St. Matthew, “καθαρίζετε” (v. 25), and “καθάρισον” (v. 26); but in St. Luke, instead of “καθαρίζετε” in the second place to match St. Matthew’s “καθάρισον,” we have the unaccountable “δότε ἐλεημοσύνην.”

I can hardly believe that any ingenuity of interpretation could extract from the passage in St. Luke, as it stands in the received text, a sentiment which we could imagine our Lord as sanctioning with His authority.

The remedy I venture to suggest is simple. It is, strike out “δότε ἐλεημοσύνην” in v. 41, and read “καθαρίζετε” instead. We shall then obtain a perfect and unexceptionable sense, and the almost verbally exact parallel with St. Matthew (interrupted by δότε ἐλεημοσύνην) is preserved.

Νῦν ὑμεῖς οἱ Φαρισαῖοι τὸ ἔξωθεν τοῦ ποτηρίου καὶ τοῦ πίνακος καθαρίζετε, τὸ δὲ ἔσωθεν ὑμῶν γέμει ἀρπαγῆς καὶ πονηρίας. ἄφρονες, οὐχ ὁ ποιήσας τὸ ἔξωθεν καὶ τὸ ἔσωθεν ἐποίησεν; πλὴν τὰ ἐνόντα καθαρίζετε. καὶ ἰδοὺ πάντα καθαρὰ ὑμῖν ἐστίν.

Taking into account the prominence of the contrast between “the inward” and “the outward” in these parallel passages, I venture to assert that St. Luke’s τὰ ἐνόντα must correspond to St. Matthew’s τὸ ἐντὸς, and, this being the case, that “καθαρίζετε” or a similar verb is absolutely required to govern “τὰ ἐνόντα.”

It remains to account for the interpolation of δότε ἐλεημοσύνην. It might be supposed that it arose from a marginal gloss “δίδοτε ἐλεημοσύνην” on “ἀποδεκατοῦτε” of v. 42; but the following is, I think, a much likelier explanation. I believe the error to have arisen from lipography on the part of a very early transcriber—lipography of a word, not a letter. The word “καθαρίζετε” occurs in St. Luke, v. 39. The transcriber, having written τὰ ἐνόντα, v. 41, should have repeated “καθαρίζετε” after it; but being vaguely conscious of having just written that word, he omits to repeat it, and proceeds καὶ ἰδοὺ, etc. The next

reviser or transcriber saw that something was lacking to the sense, and, probably having in his head a verse which occurs a little further on, St. Luke xii. 33, "πωλήσατε τὰ ὑπάρχοντα ὑμῶν καὶ δότε ἐλεημοσύνην," he jumped to the conclusion that ἐόντα = ὑπάρχοντα, and that δότε ἐλεημοσύνην was the missing phrase. The blunder may have been made by the original, or a very early transcriber, and, never having been corrected, would of course have tainted all the MSS.

As regards the metaphor by which the soul of man is spoken of as a "vessel" which, according as the interior is foul or clean, taints or preserves what is poured into it, our Lord was not the first to employ it. It was probably in vogue among the Stoic moralists.

Horace uses it twice. *Epp.* I., II. 54 :—

"Sincerum est nisi *vas*, quodcunque infundis, acescit";

and *Sermm.* I., III. 55, 56 :—

"Virtutes ipsas invertimus atque
Sincerum cupimus *vas* incrustare."

A still closer parallel than either, though expressed with cynic coarseness, is to be found in Long's Translation of Epictetus, CLXXIX., from Aulus Gellius, XVII. 19 (I abridge largely): "Quum animadverterat hominem pudore amisso, importuna industria, corruptis moribus, audacem . . . studia quoque et disciplinas philosophiae contrectare, his eum verbis increpabat: Ἀνθρωπε, ποῦ βάλλεις; σκέψαι εἰ κεκάθαρται τὸ ἀγγεῖον. ἂν γὰρ εἰς τὴν οἴησιν βάλλης, ἀπώλετο. ἦν σαπῆ, ἢ οὖρον ἢ ὄξος γένοιτ' ἂν, ἢ τι τούτων χεῖρον.

With these passages from profane writers, as well as from St. Matthew, the sentiment of verses 39–41 of St. Luke xi., restored as I suggest, is in complete agreement; but if the δότε ἐλεημοσύνην of the received text be retained, it stands in glaring discrepancy with them all.

A. A. BURD.

ON THE KNOWLEDGE OF A FUTURE STATE
POSSESSED BY THE ANCIENT HEBREWS.

IN the handsome edition of Bishop Butler's *Analogy* recently put forth by Mr. Gladstone, there are many notes which are most pertinent and useful, and which bear striking evidence to the clearness of intellect still possessed by the venerable statesman. One of these notes I desire to prefix to this paper, with the view of directing attention to it at once, while I shall afterwards return to it when the discussion in which we are to be engaged has been concluded.

The passage in Butler's work, to which the observation referred to is appended, stands as follows (Part II., Chap. vii., Sec. 49), "They (the Jews), in such a sense, nationally acknowledged and worshipped the Maker of heaven and earth, when the rest of the world were sunk in idolatry, as rendered them, in fact, the peculiar people of God. And this so remarkable an establishment and preservation of natural religion amongst them seems to add some peculiar credibility to the historical evidence for the miracles of Moses and the prophets: because these miracles are a full satisfactory account of this event, which plainly wants to be accounted for, and cannot otherwise."

It is on the words "natural religion" which occur in the above passage that Mr. Gladstone bases his annotation to the following effect (p. 342): "The expression seems not absolutely correct, because *the religion of the Jews in no way rested upon future rewards and punishments*, which Butler includes in natural religion. But with this deduction, not only was the Jewish religion a manifestation of natural religion; but it is the only one known to history; which is rarely borne in mind."

There is no singularity about the statement of Mr. Glad-

stone which I have placed in italics. On the contrary, it simply repeats what is to be found in almost all theological writers at the present day. I have selected it merely as typical of a current habit of thought, and with the object of by-and-by setting it face to face with that knowledge of a future state which, as I believe, we shall find reason to conclude was possessed by the ancient Hebrews.

I wish, then, to call attention to some remarkable passages in the New Testament, which seem to me to have been strangely overlooked, or but slightly touched upon, in dealing with this question. Two of these passages are contained in the Epistle to the Hebrews, and a third is found in our Lord's own words as recorded in St. Matthew's Gospel.

With respect to the Epistle to the Hebrews, every one knows the many difficulties which have been felt regarding it. Is it really an epistle, and not rather a dissertation? Was it originally written in Greek, or is it a translation from the Hebrew? For what readers was it primarily intended—for residents in Palestine, Alexandria, or Rome? And, above all, who was its author? Are we to ascribe it to Paul, or Barnabas, or Clement, or Apollos; or is it to be viewed as a joint composition, St. Paul perhaps supplying the thoughts, while some more accomplished Greek scholar, such as St. Luke, gave form to these in the rich and rhythmical diction by which the epistle is so strikingly distinguished?

Such are the questions which have been debated by scholars from age to age respecting this portion of Scripture, and to which the most varied answers have been given. But amid all the contradictory opinions which have been held on these topics, there is one point on which most competent critics are agreed, and that is that the writer, whoever he was, had a thorough knowledge of his subject, that subject being the religion which began with Abraham, and

was perpetuated among his descendants. Some, indeed, have gone to an extreme in the value they attached to the work of this gifted author. Dr. John Owen, for instance, said that "the world might as well want the sun as the Church this epistle"; but without the use of such extravagant language, it is generally felt by Biblical critics that we may safely trust the author's expositions, and rest with confidence in his conclusions.

To be quite just however, there is one passage in the epistle which might modify our view of the knowledge possessed by the anonymous writer, if we were to regard the difficulties which some commentators have found in it, and the almost desperate efforts they have made to remove these difficulties. I refer to chapter ix. 1-10, in which we are instructed to find several gross errors. The author, we are told, is wrong, or seems to be wrong, in placing the "golden censer" (*θυμιατήριον*, perhaps "incense-altar") in the holy of holies—wrong in placing the pot of manna and the rod of Aaron, as well as the tables of stone, in the ark of the covenant—wrong even to such an extent, according to some, as to represent the tabernacle as still standing at the time when he wrote. It would be enough to say that a writer whom Bleek justly describes as "having throughout his work treated of the Mosaic institutions with such special care,"¹ could not have fallen into such mistakes had he thought it worth his while to guard against the possibility of being charged with them. But some unworthy attempts have been made to maintain his credit by distorting the language which he employs. There can be no doubt, for instance, that, with the view of somewhat helping what seemed a bad case, our A.V. here deals unfaithfully with the tenses of the verbs which occur in the Greek. Thus the presents *εἰσίσιν* (enter), *προσφέρουσιν* (offer), *προσφέρονται* (are offered),

¹ "Welcher überhaupt vorzugsweise die mosaische Einrichtung berücksichtigte" (*Erklär.*, p. 342).

etc., are all translated as if they were pasts—*went, offered, were offered*; and the impression is thus left on the mind of the reader, that at the time when the epistle was written, the Temple worship had entirely ceased. Now all such unwarranted tampering with the sacred text comes of that worship of the letter by which so many have been enslaved, and which has led so frequently to disastrous results in the interpretation of Scripture. One of the most valuable of exegetical principles is always to keep in view the *main purpose* of a writer in any course of reasoning in which he is engaged, and to attach comparatively small importance to details which are manifestly designed to be subordinate. Bearing this in mind, we can easily see that the object of the sacred writer here is certainly not to give a full and accurate account of the various pieces of furniture existing in the tabernacle; but, passing lightly over these, to fix attention on the great truth which he brings out in the eighth verse, that the earthly tabernacle was a symbol of the true sanctuary in heaven. To ask for minute accuracy in a merely casual and rhetorical description like the present, is really little better than folly. We may quite safely grant, and I think we ought in honesty to grant, that our author does here fall into some trivial mistakes with respect to points which are not at the time prominently before his mind. He is bent on far higher things than giving an absolutely correct catalogue of the various articles which were to be found in the tabernacle. And his want of perfect correctness with regard to such things no more detracts from the supreme ability with which he sets forth the scope and spirit of the Mosaic dispensation, than the tradition that Sir Isaac Newton, as Master of the Mint, sometimes failed to add correctly a long line of figures, interferes with the pre-eminent position which he occupies as a mathematical genius; or the fact that Addison, when Secretary of State, found a difficulty in penning a brief business note,

serves to deprive him of that high position which he holds in the history of English literature.¹

With a firm conviction, then, of the authority pertaining to the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews as an exegete of the Old Testament, let us listen to what he says respecting the ancient patriarchs (chap. xi. 13-16, R.V.): "These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them and greeted them from afar, and having confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth. For they that say such things make it manifest that they are seeking after a country of their own. And if indeed they had been mindful of that country from which they went out, they would have had opportunity to return. But now they desire a better country, that is a heavenly; wherefore God is not ashamed of them to be called their God; for He hath prepared for them a city." Even a child might apprehend the import of these words. They need no subtle exegesis to bring out their meaning, but proclaim it at once to the simplest reader. The following truths are clearly implied in them—first, that the ancient Hebrew patriarchs were influenced by faith as the great motive power of their lives; secondly, that by means of it they subordinated the present to the future, looking forward to heaven as their proper home; and thirdly, that for these reasons, their lives possessed a nobility in the sight of God, who would see that their highest aspirations should at last be fulfilled in His own blessed presence. As Delitzsch has remarked (*in loc.*), "The writer here explains and illustrates the promises and wishes of the patriarchs by New Testament light, and gives to both an evangelical expression.

¹ The well-meant but fruitless efforts of Dean Alford to get rid of the difficulties above referred to are instructive. And it must be added that Tholuck does not write in the spirit of modern criticism when he remarks on the difficulty found in *vv.* 3, 4, "So erscheint es also doch als Pflicht des Interpreten, den Vorwurf eines so grossen Verstosses von dem Verf. abzuwenden." Expositors have at last learned to accept the facts of Scripture just as they are.

But in doing so, he discloses their true inward meaning. The promise given to the patriarchs was a divine assurance of a future rest: that rest was connected, in the first instance, with the future possession of an earthly home; but their desire for that home was at the same time a longing and a seeking after Him who had given the promise of it, whose presence and blessing alone made it for them an object of desire, and whose presence and blessing, wherever vouchsafed, makes the place of its manifestation to be indeed a heaven. The shell of their longing might thus be of earth, its kernel was heavenly and divine; and as such God Himself vouchsafed to honour and reward it."

And now let us look a little further down this wonderful chapter, and we read (*vv.* 24–26, R.V.), "By faith Moses, when he was grown up, refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter; choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season; accounting the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures of Egypt, for he looked unto the recompense of reward." These are truly remarkable words. They imply the very quintessence of faith with respect to the reality and rewards of a future world. Think of the "choosing rather" (*μᾶλλον ἐλόμενος*), and we recognise that decisive act of volition by which every believer separates himself from those who have their portion in this world, and by which act he says for himself, as did St. Paul (*Rom.* viii. 18), "I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us." Think of "the reproach of Christ" (*τὸν ὀνειδισμόν τοῦ Χριστοῦ*) which Moses willingly endured—the obloquy which has always, in one form or another, had to be borne by those who faithfully served the Lord in the midst of an ungodly world, and we perceive a striking anticipation of these apostolic words addressed to all God's people (*1 Pet.* iv. 14), "If ye are reproached for the name

of Christ, blessed are ye." Think of that "looking away" (*ἀπέβλεπεν*) from the passing enjoyments of our present state of existence to "the hope laid up in heaven," which is ascribed to Moses, and we find an illustration of that habitual exercise of soul which St. Paul attributes to himself and all believers when he says (2 *Cor.* iv. 18), "We look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen; for the things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are not seen are eternal."

We now turn to the words of Christ as recorded by St. Matthew, and we read as follows (chap. xxii. 31, 32), "But as touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead but of the living." The argument here made use of by Christ, in proof of a resurrection, is likely at first to excite in the reader a feeling of surprise. We may hardly see that it proves more than that the patriarchs referred to had not sunk into non-existence, but still possessed a spiritual life in the invisible world. As we reflect however on our Lord's words, we come to see the marvellous depth which exists in them, and the completeness of the proof they furnish of the doctrine in question. "I am the God of Abraham," said God; and who was Abraham? Not a mere spirit, but a *man*—a being who possessed a body as well as a soul. The relation in which Abraham stood to God had respect to his corporeal as well as incorporeal part; and this implied the vivification of his body, for "God is not the God of the dead but of the living." As Bengel puts it in his own striking way, "*Ipse est Deus vivens; ergo ii, qui Deum habent, vivere debent, et, qua parte vivere intermiserant, reviviscere in perpetuum.*" And let it be noted that Christ blames the Sadducees for not having perceived this. We read (*v.* 29) that He said unto them, "Ye do

err, not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God." They had not studied the word of God with sufficient consideration to perceive in it that great doctrine which as a sect they denied; and in this they were at fault. But we cannot doubt that it was far otherwise with Moses, to whom the words quoted by Christ were spoken, and with many of the more spiritually-minded of his countrymen, who devoutly meditated upon the Divine oracle. We know, as a matter of fact, that in the days of Christ the great majority of the Jews were firm believers (*Acts* xxiii. 8, etc.) alike in the resurrection of the body and the immortality of the soul.

After having had all this before us, let us now revert to the words of Mr. Gladstone quoted at the beginning of this paper: "The religion of the Jews in no way rested upon future rewards and punishments." If this statement is accepted without any modification, as I suppose it must be, it brings us face to face with a very strange, if not unaccountable, phenomenon. We have seen, on the very highest authority, that the ancient patriarchs, and pre-eminently Moses, lived under the power of the world to come. But now we are confronted with the fact that the great Jewish lawgiver, in the religious system which he established, took no account whatever of a future state. Such is the position occupied by those who believe (as the present writer does) that Moses was the author of the legislative code contained in the Pentateuch. I may remark however in passing, that many in our day do not assent to this. We are told by Wellhausen and his followers that Moses had little or nothing to do with the system of laws which bears his name. That code, it is said, must be relegated to post-exilic times. With this theory I am just now in no wise concerned, beyond expressing my disbelief in it, and pointing out that, if adopted,

it simply intensifies the difficulty which has been suggested. For, by general consent, the Jews, as a nation, had come firmly to believe in a state of rewards and punishments hereafter before their return from the exile, and yet it is imagined that their law was then for the first time promulgated, without the slightest reference to a world beyond the grave. That however, as has been already said, is a point with which I have at present nothing to do, and which must be left to be dealt with by Wellhausen and those who accept his views. I have here only to consider the position of those who hold that Moses was the human author of the Jewish religious system, and yet that, while himself a steadfast believer in immortality, he made no reference in any of his enactments to the doctrine of a future state. Some explanation of this singular fact must be attempted.

The first theory at which we may glance is that of Bishop Warburton. I know that it is usual at the present day among writers of all sorts—believers no less than unbelievers—to speak of Warburton and his *Divine Legation of Moses* with derision. But it was not so that such a competent critic as Samuel Johnson judged either of the man or his work. Referring to the man himself, Johnson said, “Warburton is perhaps the last man who has written with a mind full of reading and reflection.” And referring to the work, he declared, “The table is always full, Sir. He brings things from the north, and the south, and from every quarter. In his *Divine Legation* you are always entertained.”¹ Warburton’s bold and original idea was to change what had been thought a formidable objection to the Jewish religion into a conclusive proof of its supernatural character. Let me endeavour to state the argument as briefly as possible. Warburton rests his theory on the two following principles, first, that no religion could, in

¹ Life, by Boswell, chap. lxxi.

ordinary circumstances, be established in the world without a reference to future rewards and punishments; and, secondly, that no doctrine as to recompense or retribution hereafter is to be found in the system instituted by Moses. From these premises his inference is, that the Jewish dispensation must have been set up and sustained by "an extraordinary Providence," *i.e.*, it must have had a superhuman origin, and been attended by constant miraculous interpositions on the part of God. The divine mission of Moses is thus thought to have been proved, and the author regards his demonstration as "very little short of mathematical certainty." I cannot quite accept this estimate of his argument; but the *Legation* is undoubtedly a very able as well as erudite book.

Another solution which, although accepted by some, appears to me far more paradoxical than that of Warburton, has been proposed by the late Dean Stanley. In his *Lectures on the Jewish Church* (i. 135), the Dean writes: "The fact becomes of real religious importance if we trace the ground on which this silence respecting the future was based. Not from want of religion, but (if one might use the expression) from excess of religion, was this void left in the Jewish mind. The future life was not denied or contradicted, but it was overlooked, set aside, overshadowed by the consciousness of the living, actual presence of God Himself. That truth, at least in the limited conceptions of the youthful nation, was too vast to admit of any rival truth, however precious." This is surely an extraordinary description of the Israelites of the desert. Their minds were too full of God to admit the rival idea of eternity! And yet these were the very persons respecting whom God is again and again represented as saying in Scripture (*Ps.* xcv. 11; *Heb.* iv. 3, 7), "I swear in my wrath that they should not enter into my rest." The language used about them by Jehovah in the Psalm referred to (*v.* 10), denotes

utter loathing.¹ They were sensualists and idolaters: "they rebelled and vexed His Holy Spirit"; they proved themselves utterly insensible to all those manifestations of the Divine majesty and goodness it was their privilege to witness; and therefore that generation which is so strangely spoken of as having suffered from "excess of religion," was left, with hardly an exception, to fall in the wilderness.

This leads me now to state, in conclusion, what I humbly regard as the true reason why Moses did not include in his legislative code any reference to a future state of rewards and punishments. *The people of the Jews were not then prepared for such a revelation, nor would they have profited by it.* Their long and abject slavery in Egypt had wrought its own proper work upon them. Everything leads us to regard the Israelites of the Exodus as having been in the most debased condition. They were, in fact, little better than a barbarous horde, having no noble aspirations, and capable only of being influenced by the most sordid motives. From beginning to end they utterly disappointed Moses. He began his mission to them by rescuing one of their number from the oppression of an Egyptian, and supposed, as St. Stephen tells us (*Acts vii. 25*), "that his brethren would have understood how that God by his hand would deliver them: but they understood not." On the contrary, on the very next day he was grossly insulted by one of them, and had to flee from Egypt to save his life. The same spirit continued to be displayed throughout. As soon as they had the least experience of suffering, we are told (*Exod. xvii. 3, 4*) that "the people murmured against Moses, and said, Wherefore is this that thou hast brought us up out of Egypt, to kill us and our

¹ See *The Translation of the Psalms*, with notes, by Dr. John De Witt, New Brunswick Seminary. The writer remarks that the word here used by God with respect to the Israelites in the desert "indicates great disturbance of mind, displeasure, and antipathy."

children, and our cattle with thirst? And Moses cried unto the Lord, saying, What shall I do unto this people? They be almost ready to stone me." Again, when Moses lingered in the mount, we read (*Exod.* xxxii. 1) that the people came to Aaron, and addressed him in these words of insensate folly, "Up, make us gods which shall go before us; for as for this Moses, the man that brought us up out of the land of Egypt, we wot not what is become of him." Let me quote only one other passage as bringing before us in darkest outlines the grovelling and sensual spirit which the people legislated for by Moses displayed. We read (*Num.* xi. 4-6), "The children of Israel also wept again, and said, Who shall give us flesh to eat? We remember the fish which we did eat in Egypt freely; the cucumbers, and the melons, and the leeks, and the onions, and the garlick: but now our soul is dried away; there is nothing at all, besides this manna, before our eyes." How vain would have been the endeavour to bring high and spiritual motives to bear upon a people sunk so low as this! What cared they about the invisible world! Rewards and punishments in *this* life they could understand, but, in the language of Scripture, they were too "brutish" to feel the influence of what was future and unseen. And hence it is no reproach to the Mosaic law that it limited its sanctions to the present world. That was the only discipline which could have any good effect upon such a people. We are told by Christ (*Matt.* xix. 8) that Moses allowed a certain permission to stand in that law which he issued to the Jews "because of the hardness of their hearts." The permission itself was not good, but the evil nature of the people required it. And, following the same analogy, we may say that Moses did not set future retribution before the men of his day because he knew that the thought of such a thing would have no effect upon them; but restricted his promises and threats to this world, because, owing to

their low and ignoble natures, it was only what appealed immediately to the senses that could have any influence over their conduct.

While, however, as a Lawgiver, Moses thus did not take the invisible and spiritual world into account, he doubtless often spoke of the great hope of his own heart to those like-minded with himself. There were still some who clung to the old Patriarchal religion. We find, indeed, that, even in the darkest hour of Israel's history, noble souls continued to cherish the sublime doctrine of immortality, and from time to time gave it more or less definite expression. In the forty-ninth Psalm, the different futures which await the righteous and the wicked are contrasted, and it is said of the one class with respect to the other, "The upright shall have dominion over them in the morning." In the seventy-third Psalm, there is a magnificent outburst of individual faith in the hereafter, when the writer exclaims with reference to God, "Thou shalt guide me with thy counsel, and afterward receive me to glory." The light goes on deepening and spreading as we advance through the prophetic books, while still dimness lingers, and doubt seems occasionally to prevail: it is not, indeed, till Christ appears that all darkness is dispelled as to the existence of a future world, in which every one shall "receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad"; and thus, as the Apostle declares (2 *Tim.* i. 10), it is He alone who has clearly and fully "brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel."

A. ROBERTS.

PROFESSOR DRUMMOND'S RELIGIOUS
TEACHING.

IF the influence of a spiritual teacher is to be measured by the number of lives that have been touched to finer issues by his spoken and written word, few if any teachers of the last quarter of the century have been more influential than Henry Drummond. Critics speculate as to whether *Natural Law in the Spiritual World* and *The Ascent of Man* will live. Even should these books be soon forgotten, their author has left behind him a far more enduring monument in the thousands of young men in every part of Protestant Christendom who thank God for the spiritual lessons they learned at the feet of the loved teacher over whose early death they are to-day mourning. Widely read as his books have been, their influence has perhaps been inconsiderable as compared with the influence he exercised upon those who were brought into direct contact with the magnetic force of his personality. His teaching was indeed strikingly fresh and suggestive, but the teacher was greater than the teaching. Those who knew him best were the readiest to confess not only that he was "the best of all the men they had ever known," but also that over and above the beauty of his Christian character he was endowed with a rich and strong individuality that fascinated them as by a subtle, subduing spell. There was a unique impressiveness in his platform speaking; there were beauty of thought and charm of diction in his addresses, but the truest secret of his power as a speaker lay in the thousand subtle influences radiating forth from the personality of the speaker. He did something more than present spiritual truth in new lights, and with a wealth of attractive illustrations; he poured forth of his own rich personality into the hearts of those who hung upon his words.

Dr. Stalker has paid a warm tribute to the personal worth of his life-long friend. This is a theme on which all who were privileged to be inspired by Professor Drummond's friendship love to dwell; it was a theme which evoked perpetual admiration and thankfulness to the Giver of all good; but my object in the present article is to draw attention to his religious teaching with special reference to the development which took place in his grasp of spiritual truth.

Professor Drummond began his career as an Evangelist, and to the end Evangelism was the master passion of his life. He was qualified by the versatility of his gifts to play many rôles—to be an expounder of science, an explorer, a man of letters, a social reformer—but the rôle he deliberately chose and adhered to was that of Christ's Evangelist, especially to young men. It is from this standpoint that his teaching ought to be judged. He never pretended to be a teacher of systematic theology, bound to assign its due place to every theological doctrine in a rounded system. His ambition was to win men for Christ and Christ's service. An Evangelist cannot hope to impress his hearers by truth which he has not himself *seen*, which has not mastered his own heart. One secret of Drummond's success as an Evangelist lay just here—that even at the risk of being misunderstood and criticised, he would not say “what he ought to have said,” but spoke with an accent of intense personal conviction the truth by which he had himself been gripped and held. In the eyes of the systematic theologian, he was necessarily one-sided. There were aspects of Christian truth which fell into the background in his message. But in this sense every successful Evangelist is one-sided. There are diversities of Christian experience; and while there are diversities of Christian experience, Evangelists who speak their message not out of a theological textbook, but “out of the abundance of the heart,” will show diversities in the emphasis they lay on the different

aspects of Christian truth. Critics may be justified in wishing that an Evangelist's Christian experience had been other than it is, but they do not wisely quarrel with an Evangelist for laying emphasis in his preaching on the truth by which he has himself been most strongly mastered. It is true, as has been often pointed out, that Professor Drummond is one-sided in his teaching on Sin. He gives us no such analysis of this side of human experience as St. Augustine. He had no such equipment for this analysis as St. Augustine possessed by his own experience of years of struggle with fierce temptation. He knew little of sore struggle of that sort; beyond any one I have ever known, he bore the white flower of a blameless life through boyhood and youth into manhood; he was one of those "favourites of heaven in point of character" referred to in a passage of great eloquence by Canon Mozley: "How or why have these victors gained their crowns without the disfigurement and alloy of that struggle which leaves its stamp on so many? We know not. It is a mystery to us. But we must recognise the fact that it does please the Almighty to endow some of His creatures from the first with extraordinary graces."

An Evangelist need not be greatly disturbed by a charge of one-sidedness: in one sense, one-sidedness is a condition of his success. There is a more important question: What is the worth of the aspects of Christian truth on which he *does* lay emphasis? It is not difficult to get at the heart of Professor Drummond's message. It is summed up for us in a beautiful story he tells in *The Changed Life*: "There lived once a young girl whose perfect grace of character was the wonder of those who knew her. She wore on her neck a gold locket which no one was ever allowed to open. One day, in a moment of unusual confidence, one of her companions was allowed to touch its spring and learn its secret. She saw written these words—'Whom having not seen I

love.' That was the secret of her beautiful life. She had been changed into the same image." From the first weeks of his association with Mr. D. L. Moody, the American Evangelist, on through the twenty-three years that followed, he never ceased to plead with those whom he addressed to form and cultivate a friendship with Christ. "Make Christ your most constant companion"—that might stand as the keynote of his message. "Then you reduce religion to a common friendship? A common friendship—Who talks of a *common* friendship? There is no such thing in the world. On earth no word is more sublime. Friendship is the nearest thing we know to what religion is. God is love. And to make religion akin to friendship is simply to give it the highest expression conceivable by man."

Whatever may be said about the one-sidedness of Professor Drummond's presentation of Christianity, this, at any rate, can surely be claimed for him—that the side of Christianity he does present is one of cardinal importance. "Friendship with Christ" takes us well into the very heart of Christianity. "Friendship with Christ" has been the secret of the enthusiasm, self-sacrifice, and beauty of the Christian life; it has been the secret of the Christian mysticism of St. Paul and of St. John, and of every type of fervent evangelical piety; it has been the power by which the Church has accomplished her mission and achieved her spiritual triumphs. In the sixteenth century the revival of Christianity in western Europe was associated with the proclamation of salvation by faith in Christ—at bottom but another rendering of the formula "salvation through friendship with Christ." In laying emphasis on this element of Christianity, Professor Drummond had got hold of the central force of the whole Christian movement.

His Gospel of Friendship with Christ (or salvation by faith) was eagerly welcomed by thousands of young men on both sides of the Atlantic. The preacher had, it is

true, singular personal qualifications for gaining the ear of educated young men. He was a beautiful speaker, well versed in modern literature, and able to clothe his thoughts in "shining vesture." He had "seen almost all the beautiful things God had made," and "enjoyed almost every pleasure that He had planned for man," and gave his hearers the impression of one who himself, not in spite but in virtue of his Christianity, lived a rich, wide, and sunny life. He was known to be keenly interested in science and modern scientific theories, and had a rare power of freshening his subject with illustrations from the realm of science as aptly chosen as they were exquisitely worked out; and the mere fact that science and religion had at least a personal reconciliation in the speaker, won him a hearing where others would have failed. He had a wide knowledge of human life; he had seen "many men and cities," and with human sympathies as keen as his knowledge was wide, he could readily throw himself alongside of the life experiences of those to whom he made his appeals. Qualifications such as these were his personal equipment, but his success as an Evangelist lay in the message he proclaimed—the power of friendship with Christ for life; "a more abundant life than they have, a life abundant in love, and therefore abundant in salvation for themselves, and large in enterprise for the alleviation and redemption of the world." To young men thirsting for "more life and higher," perplexed with theological doubts, and alienated from mere ecclesiasticism, this message of salvation through friendship with Christ was welcomed as a discovery in religion: to multitudes the reception of the message was the beginning or restarting of their Christian life.

To this conception of the essence of Christianity as friendship with Christ, Professor Drummond adhered, as I have said, from the beginning to the end. But some of his views underwent considerable change. His first

book, *Natural Law in the Spiritual World*, no longer represented his position in his maturer years. In examining the growth of his teaching, the interest of this book lies not in the proofs he brought forward from the laws of biological science, but in what he wished to prove. The most valuable chapters in the book are those which deal in the simple fashion of edifying discourse with the experiences of the spiritual life, such as the chapters on Degeneration, Growth, Semi-Parasitism, and Parasitism. But these are not the chapters in which the author was himself interested. The introduction, and the chapters on Biogenesis and Classification, contain the burden of his message, for the sake of which the volume was published. There are two related thoughts in these chapters which were dominant in his teaching for many years—the distinctiveness of the spiritual or Christ life, as contrasted with the highest merely ethical life, and the sudden, inexplicable descent of the spiritual life into a man's soul. Mr. Drummond was aware that these two thoughts, in the somewhat exaggerated form they assumed in his mind, met with no cordial reception even from many Christian teachers. When it dawned upon him that, uncongenial as they might seem, they were vouched for by science itself, he was thrilled (as his friends can well recall) with a sense of the importance of the discovery as a new and unlooked-for defence of what seemed to him a capital part of evangelical religion. Questions were naturally raised by this proposed new apologetic: ought not the laws of the spiritual world to be determined by an investigation of the phenomena of the spiritual world? Can biological science give much help in the interpretation of an experience of which self-consciousness and self-determination are prime factors? Even if the doctrine of spontaneous generation is discredited in favour of biogenesis (*omne vivum ex vivo*), is any additional argument thereby gained for the theory

of the sudden beginning of the Christ life? Must not the question be settled by an investigation of the facts of spiritual experience? Even if it is true that there is a gulf fixed between the inorganic kingdom and the organic, between a stone and a plant, does that constitute an argument for separating the highest ethical life from the Christ life by so wide a gulf as is suggested in *Natural Law*? Questions such as these are inevitably raised, and are not easily answered. But the interest of the book lies, as I have said, in the positions the author wishes to make good by his elaborate and ingenious arguments from biological science. The book is an impressive testimony to Professor Drummond's conviction of the reality and supreme worth of the distinctively Christ life, and to his conviction both of the need and possibility of spiritual conversion.

In later years Professor Drummond had himself lost interest in the line of argument pursued in the chapters on Biogenesis and Classification. On the scientific side, he had come to lay less emphasis on breaks or gaps in the life of the universe; and on the religious side, while he never ceased to adhere to his conviction of the supreme worth of the Christ life and of the need and possibility of spiritual renewal, he had come to recognise a closer affinity between the ethical and the spiritual life. To the question, What is the essential difference between spiritual beauty and moral beauty? he had answered in *Natural Law* that it is the distinction between the organic and the inorganic; and in his theory of conversion he so magnified the Divine action as to suggest that man himself had little to do with the change, and that his old ethical life had little of any causal relation to his new life. This exaggeration of Calvinism passes away in his later teaching. "Where does joy come from? I knew a Sunday scholar whose conception of joy was that it was a thing made in

lumps and kept somewhere in heaven, and that when people prayed for it, pieces were somehow let down and fitted into their souls. . . . In reality, joy is as much a matter of cause and effect as pain." "Try to give up the idea that religion comes to us by chance or by mystery or by caprice. It comes to us by natural law or by supernatural law, for all law is Divine. Edward Irving went to see a dying boy once, and when he entered the room he just put his hand on the sufferer's head and said, 'My boy, God loves you,' and went away. And the boy started from his bed and called out to the people in the house, 'God loves me! God loves me!' It changed that boy. The sense that God loved him overpowered him, melted him down, and began the creating of a new heart in him. And that is how the love of God melts down the unlovely heart in man and begets in him the new creature, who is patient and humble and gentle and unselfish. And there is no other way to get it. There is no mystery about it. We love others, we love everybody, we love our enemies, because He first loved us." So far was he from seeking to empty the ethical life of its significance as in *Natural Law*, that he strove assiduously in later years to read ethical significance into all the old theological doctrines, and several of his friends he urged to undertake the task of restating the old doctrines in terms of their ethical import.

Another advance upon his earlier teaching is marked by his increased appreciation of the spiritual worth of the social organism and his increased emphasis upon social duty. "Natural Law" represents individualism in religion. The relation of the individual to God, the friendship of the individual with Christ, the growth of the individual in Christlikeness—these are the topics which filled the sphere of his vision in his earlier years. He carried over this conviction of the supreme importance of

the spiritual life of the individual into his later teaching. "It is here, he says in *The City Without a Church*, "that the older, the more individual conception of Christianity did such mighty work for the world—it produced good men. . . . Good men even with small views are immeasurably more important than small men with great views. But given good men, such men as were produced even by the self-centered theology of an earlier generation, and add that wider outlook and social ideal which are coming to be the characteristics of the religion of the age, and Christianity has an equipment for the reconstruction of the world before which nothing can stand." To his earlier individualism he himself added this "wider outlook and social ideal." Nor is it difficult to trace the origin of this growth in his outlook—in loyalty to Christ and Christ's teaching. It was at Christ's feet that he learned the impressive lessons on the Kingdom of God and social service he has read us in *The Programme of Christianity* and *The City Without a Church*." The Socialism—if I may use this word not in its technical but general meaning—of his later years is in striking contrast to the extreme individualism of his earlier years; but his socialism was deeply rooted in his individualism—in his personal loyalty to Him whose watchword was the Kingdom of God, and who said to His disciples, Whosoever would be first among you shall be your servant.

If *Natural Law in the Spiritual World* was an apologetic for his early individualism, no less is the *The Ascent of Man* an apologetic for his later socialism. *The Ascent of Man*, whether we have regard to its literary style or its intellectual power, is unquestionably his greatest book. Here again, for the study of his religious teaching, the chief interest of the book is not in its proofs, but in what it seeks to prove—that love, or the struggle for the life of others, is a law deeply embedded in the whole life of

the universe. Love, service, sympathy, sacrifice, co-operation, brotherhood—these were dominant thoughts in his own “wider outlook and social ideal.” One may question whether it is necessary to appeal to “nature” for a sanction to the law of love in our social life, and one may question whether the author is successful in obtaining from “nature” the sanction of which he is in search; but no one can read this brilliant volume without being impressed by the social enthusiasm which lies behind its reasoning and eloquence.

It has been said that Professor Drummond had already given the world the best work he was likely to achieve before he was struck down in the prime of his manhood. It seems to me that there are indications in *The Ascent of Man* that, had he been spared, he would have given us work of a still higher quality. The concluding chapter on Involution shows an appreciation of the import of an idealistic philosophy which is a new feature in his thinking. “Are we even quite sure that what we call a physical world is, after all, a physical world? . . . The very term ‘material world,’ we are told, is a misnomer, that the world is a spiritual world, merely employing ‘matter’ for its manifestations.” “Evolution is not progress in matter. Matter cannot progress. It is a progress in spirit in that which is limitless, in that which is at once most human, most rational, most divine.” “Evolution is Advolution; better, it is revelation—the phenomenal expression of the divine, the progressive realization of the ideal, the ascent of Love.” I cannot help feeling that Professor Drummond hampered himself needlessly by seeking arguments for the laws of the spiritual world in Nature. The sentences I have quoted show how he was beginning to work himself free of this hampering influence by recognising that spirit is the prius of matter, that nature is itself only interpretable through the mind of man, or (to use his own phrase) the spiritual

world. No one could have adopted a more hospitable attitude towards new truth. Had he lived to follow out the hints contained in the last chapter of *The Ascent of Man*, he had it in him to do work as an Evangelist to the scientific and cultured classes for which the great work he has already done would have seemed but a preparation.

Thy leaf has perished in the green,
And, while we breathe beneath the sun,
The world which credits what is done
Is cold to all that might have been,

So here shall silence guard thy fame,
But somewhere out of human view,
Whate'er thy hands are set to do,
Is wrought with tumult of acclaim.

D. M. Ross.

THE BOOK OF JOB AND ITS LATEST
COMMENTATOR.

PART I.

THE difficulties of the Book of Job are commensurate with its importance. It is the chief merit of Prof. Budde's important work on Job that it recognises these difficulties, and makes a new and determined effort to overcome them. The course which the author takes shows him to be altogether up to date. He gives the chief prominence to questions of text, knowing that problems of the higher criticism and of Biblical theology depend ultimately on the trustworthiness and intelligibility of the text. Interesting therefore as it would be to treat of the Book of Job as one of the great masterpieces of religious literature, I am debarred from giving myself this pleasure. Unless we have a sound text, we cannot be sure of not distorting the thought of the ancient poet or poets. I must therefore, in the first instance, follow the author into text-critical discussions, and only regret that the character of this magazine prevents as complete a discussion as might be desirable.

Three scholars have within the last few years rendered special services to the text of Job—Bickell, Siegfried, and Beer. The brilliant pioneering work of Bickell cannot be disregarded even by those who think, with Dillmann,¹ that he has exaggerated the value of the Sahidic version of the LXX. This version, of which we possess nearly the whole

¹ *Textkritisches zum Buche Ijob* (1890). Cf. my notice in *EXPOSITOR*, 1891 (ii.), pp. 142 ff.

(xxxix. 9b-xl. 7 is the only lacuna) does indeed represent the pre-Origenian LXX. text, but it does not appear that it corresponds to the Hebrew MS. which the translator used. According to Dillmann and Budde, it is rather a recast of the text in the interests of Greek readers than a faithful translation, and with some reservations I am compelled to share this view. This does not however exclude the possibility that some or even many of the omissions of the earlier LXX. text may be justifiable on grounds of internal criticism, and that the translator may have been partly guided by marginal signs indicating the non-originality of certain passages, which signs, as, *e.g.*, in the case of xxviii. 15-19¹ (one verse too little, and one verse too much), he may not always have rightly understood. Each omission of the LXX. must therefore be carefully considered. Bickell's metrical theory (that nearly all the poetical part of Job falls into tetrastichs or quatrains) has also to be examined, and, in fact, Budde spares no pains in performing this duty. Siegfried and Beer have also done good service by their careful use of the versions; the former also by his zealous hunt for glosses, and both by conjectural but not therefore arbitrary emendations.

Budde too has no objection to pointing out glosses, and he shows more judgment than Siegfried in doing this. I think, however, that his prejudice against Bickell (whose metrical theory is as uncongenial to Budde as his estimate of the Sahidic version) has hindered him from recognising some that really exist. In chaps. iii.-vi. this is notably the case. Budde sometimes defends the indefensible, and produces an unsatisfactory text.² In chap. iii. the only corrections of the text which he accepts are those in *vv.* 3, 6,

¹ Cf. Dillmann, *op. cit.*, p. 16.

² The English reader has a useful translation of the "original poem of Job," as reconstructed by Bickell, in Dillon's *Sceptics of the Old Testament*. But a Hebraistic appendix is sorely wanted.

16; in chap. iv., those in *vv.* 2, 6, 19; in chap. v., those in *vv.* 3, 5, 7, 15, 27; in chap. vi., those in *vv.* 4, 7, 17, 21. Of these the most important are those relating to v. 7 and 15. The former verse is rendered thus in the Revised Version,—

“But man is born unto trouble,
As the sparks fly upward.”

This rendering is accepted even by the cautious Dillmann. But is it satisfactory? It requires this exegesis,—trouble is inherent in human nature, and is as inevitable as the upward movement of sparks. The previous verse however appears to state the very opposite of this, viz., that trouble is not a natural growth like weeds, which spring up unplanted. Dillmann therefore asks us to supply mentally “being sinful” between “man” and “is born.” This no doubt harmonizes the statement with the ideas of Eliphaz; but would not such a stylist as the author have expressed himself more intelligibly? Hence Budde suggests taking *לְעֵמֶל* as the accusative, and pointing *יֹולֵד*, which gives this sense: “For man *begets* trouble” (Beer also adopts this view). The second line he explains quite differently from Dillmann and from our Bible. He retains the rendering “sparks” for *בְּגֵי רֶשֶׁף*, but makes “sparks” a figurative expression for the troubles “begotten” by sinful man. But I fear even this acute interpretation is hardly tenable. Budde’s grammatical view of line 1 is almost as unnatural as his exegetical view of line 2. He proposes indeed to omit *ל* before *עֵמֶל*, but is there cause enough for this boldness? Is the condensed expression, “man begets trouble,” a probable one? In Job xv. 35 a fuller phrase is used. Not less serious are the objections to Budde’s view of line 2. Is it probable that “sparks” is equivalent to “troubles begotten by sinful man”? And, to go further back, is the prevalent rendering “sparks” correct? *רֶשֶׁף*

(*resheph*) is, so far as I know, only used of a supernatural flame, such as lightning (Ps. lxxviii. 48; Ecclus. xliii. 17, Heb. text), or the flame which was thought by the Hebrews to produce fever (Deut. xxxii. 24). This is in accordance with the fact that a Phœnician god was called Resheph, and excludes all interpretations of בְּנֵי רֶשֶׁף but two,¹ viz., (1) "God's fiery ministers of punishment" (as proposed by me in Stade's *Zeitschrift*, 1891, p. 184), and (2) "the angels," who, according to the later Jewish theology, were made of fire (cf. Ps. civ. 4b). I suspect that the latter interpretation is correct. Verses 2-6 should probably be omitted,² and verses 1 and 7 brought close together. This is what Eliphaz probably means to say: "Seek, if you will, for some one of the heavenly beings to take your part (the 'holy ones,' he calls them). It will be in vain. Your request is unreasonable, for trouble is natural to man; and besides, the angels are entirely occupied with superterrestrial matters ('the sons of fire fly on high'—on the wings of the wind)."

On the whole, Budde's criticism of the text of chaps. iii.-vi. is disappointing. It is no doubt much in advance of Dillmann's; but, in spite of occasional good suggestions (*e.g.*, at iii. 3 and v. 15³), he does not sufficiently recognise the faultiness of our present text. In iii. 5, for instance, he keeps כְּמַרִּיר, rendering it "darkening (of the day)"; so Revised Version, "all that maketh black (the day)." But I greatly fear that the root כָּמַר, "to be black," is non-

¹ The attempt of Bateson Wright to justify the meaning "eaglet" (*Job*, 1883, p. 145) is at most ingenious. But how can Siegfried dream of correcting בְּנֵי רֶשֶׁף? Tradition explained בני רֶשֶׁף of birds. Cf. Driver, *Deut.*, p. 368, and see LXX., Ecclus. xliii. 17.

² *Vv.* 3-5 are perhaps a variant to iv. 8-11. The author may have rejected this passage and placed it in the margin, and the editor may have given it the best place he could find, linking it with its present context by *vv.* 2 and 6. Note in *v.* 3 the characteristic אֲנִי ("I") of Eliphaz.

³ The former had already been made (after LXX.) by Bickell (1886) and Beer (1895).

existent; and even were it otherwise, Budde's view makes the passage tautological. It is therefore worth proposing two possible corrections. The first is the bolder one, but, as I think, hits the mark. It is to read *כְּמוֹ אֲרֵרֵי יוֹם*, "let them (viz., darkness and gloom) affright it like the cursers of the day." This seems to be a modification of a variant of *v. 8a*, formed by the addition of *כְּמוֹ*, to adapt the line to its present position. The line was inserted in error, and ought therefore to be omitted in a corrected text. There is a trace of the right reading in LXX. The alternative is to read *כְּמֹרְרֵי יוֹם*, "as those who rebelled against [the God of] the day" (cf. *כְּמֹרְרֵי אֹר*, Job xxiv. 13), or *כְּמֹרְרֵי יָם*, "as the rebels of the ocean." In this case the line can be retained, though its position will have to be changed. Whichever view we adopt—I have indicated my own strong preference—there is a mythological allusion to the fate of the dragon *Tiāmat*, which defied the Divine Creator, and of that dragon's "helpers" (Job ix. 13), for which see the Babylonian creation-story, fourth tablet, lines 110 ff. To this dragon and to similar monsters there are several allusions in Job, and notably in iii. 8, where Budde has, after consideration, rejected what Gunkel, Beer, and myself believe to be a sound as well as easy correction.

Job iii. 8 runs thus in Rodwell's version,—

"Let those who curse days lay their ban upon it,
Those who are of skill to rouse up Leviathan!"

Now "those who curse days" is not a natural phrase where a night is spoken of. And if it be said to mean magicians who have skill to produce eclipses, the answer is that from books of folklore we only know of a magic which could keep off eclipses. Besides, this version of the passage makes an incomplete parallelism. And when we recollect the references in a late prophecy and a late psalm to a dragon or dragons in the sea (Isa. xxvii. 1; Ps. lxxiv. 13),

and in Amos (ix. 3—the only pre-Exilic passage in which an allusion to the dragon-myth exists in our Old Testament) to a serpent at the bottom of the sea which, at Jehovah's bidding, could destroy a multitude of men, and then throw upon this the bright light of Babylonian mythology, it becomes natural to admit Schmidt's and Gunkel's correction "sea" (ים) for "day" (יום), and give this revised rendering of the distich,—

"Let those who lay a ban upon the ocean, curse it,
Who are appointed¹ to rouse up Leviathan."

It may originally have been the waters of heaven to which the conquered monster was assigned ("there was war in heaven," says the Apocalypse of John); but the writer of Job more probably thinks of the lower ocean, which, like the other forces of nature, is under the charge of angelic beings.² Budde's opposite view can of course be maintained, but it seems to me to make an unnecessary inconsistency in the Hebrew dragon-myth.

I have been thus minute, because this is a matter of some importance. The opening speech of Job is a specimen of the higher rhetoric which deserves to be seen in all its beauty, and the revival of a mythological interest in the later period is a phenomenon (by no means denied by Budde) which requires investigation. And lastly as to כמריר: it is really time that we began to purify the Hebrew Lexicon. To assume a root כמר, "to be black," in order to support a modern view of a very suspicious-looking group of letters, is no better, and is perhaps even worse, than assuming a root עיק, "to straiten," or "to

¹ On עָתִיר, see Driver's excellent note, *Deut.*, p. 374, to which a reference to Job xv. 28 might be added.

² Originally the dragon was the personification of the primeval ocean (תְּהוֹם). See Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos*, p. 59; and cf. my review, *Critical Review*, July, 1895.

vociferate," in order to justify עקת in Ps. lv. 4, and a root נוף, "to be elevated," to defend, נוף, in Ps. xlvi. 2.

I will only mention two more passages in chaps. iii.-vi., which I would ask Budde to reconsider. One is iii. 14, which he renders thus,—

"With kings and counsellors of the land,
Who built themselves palace-tombs."

With Ewald and others he finds here a reference to the pyramids, and thinks that הַרְבֹּת (hōrābōt) may be a distorted form of *hirām* or *ahrām*, the word used for the pyramids by early Arabic historians, which may, as Delitzsch thinks, be a Semitized form of *amr*, "an old Egyptian name for the pyramids." This looks very dubious. Must one give reasons? Must one refer to Jablonski's errors about Behemoth and Remphan? Or quote Pierret (*Dict. d'arch. ég.*, p. 465), who gives the Egyptian name as *ab-mer*? May one not simply say that theories like this are not strictly critical? הַרְבֹּת means "ruined places," and neither "tombs" nor "pyramids." Is it not clear that Olshausen was right in correcting אַרְכָּנוֹת, "palaces" (cf. *v.* 15*b*)? The other passage is *v.* 3*b*, which Rodwell renders thus,—

"I myself have seen the impious striking root,
But at once I cursed his dwelling."

Clearly "I cursed" must be wrong; it makes the judgment on the impious man the effect of the curse of Eliphaz. Feeling this, Budde suggests, for וַאֲקוּב, וַיִּפְקֵר, "stood empty." Both reading and translation seem to me too bold. Should we not read וַיִּקַּב? Siegfried and Beer would read וַיִּרְקַב, appealing to LXX. But וַיִּרְקַב, or rather וַיִּרְקַב, is not less corrupt than וַאֲקוּב. The same corruption seems to occur in the Massoretic text of Prov. x. 7, where for וַיִּקַּב we should probably (with Krochmal) read וַיִּקַּב. Render therefore, "But suddenly his habitation was cursed" (*viz.*, by God).

I have still to consider Budde's relation to the strophic theory of Bickell, as applied to these three chapters. In many parts of his volume Budde exposes, without any difficulty, the arbitrariness of the great metrist. But there are not a few other parts in which Budde's arrangement of the text is inferior to Bickell's, and chaps. iii.-vi. supply an instance of this. There certainly is here, and more especially in chap. iii., a strong tendency to four-line stanzas. I admit indeed (see above) that Bickell is wrong in omitting iii. 8*b* as "an addition suggested by xli. 2." But this scholar is perfectly right, in my opinion, in all his other omissions. It is true, we thus get one stichus too much, viz., *v.* 9*a*, which Bickell, against parallelism, substitutes for *v.* 8*b*. The remedy is a simple one, and it will, I am sure, be congenial to Budde. It is to make a five-line stanza out of verses 9 and 10. The poet is not to be kept too strictly to rule, though the extraordinary long lines in iii. 26 and vii. 4, and the extraordinary short lines in ix. 21, xvii. 1, which seem to Budde to give such admirable expression to the thought, are (as a keener critic could probably show) illusory.

The reader will see from this specimen how numerous are the problems which Budde opens, but hardly settles. It is his great merit to have opened them; and however disappointed I may be at the frequent inadequacy of his treatment of them, I must not be supposed to think lightly of his book. Few indeed could have written it. But I am bound, as a humble fellow-worker, to ask the author to reconsider much that he has said. I cannot here say a twentieth part of what calls for expression. But I will ask leave in passing to mention a few things more relative to the undisputed portion of the speeches in Job. Budde sees that viii. 15 is a later insertion, but overlooks the probability that it has taken the place of an illegible passage which introduced the parable of the creeping plant. He also

spoils the parable by rejecting Merx's admirable corrections of *v.* 17. The heap of stones and the house of stones are, as I believe, purely imaginary.¹ On *vii.* 12, *ix.* 13 (*xxvi.* 12), the correct mythological interpretation is given.—*vii.* 17. Budde misses the best explanation of the superfluous לִי. The scribe began to write לַיְלֹת, "nights" (see *b*), instead of יְרַחִי, "months."—*ix.* 23. For the impossible לְכַפֹּת, read לְכַכֹּת (Grätz).—*x.* 15. Here Budde is right against Bickell. A tristich (Budde), or rather a pentastich, seems unavoidable: Budde rightly corrects וְיָהּ עָנִי (cf. Geiger, Lagarde). But in *v.* 17 he can hardly be right. Of the third stichus only a forced rendering can be given: Revised Version renders, "Changes and warfare are with me" in the text, and (boldly) "Host after host is against me" in the margin. Surely it is a corrupt gloss on the first stichus, and should be corrected תַּחֲלִיף זָבָאִיךָ עָמִי, *i.e.*, "thou bringest fresh hosts against me." The first stichus also needs correction; for וְעַדְיָךָ read בְּעַדְיָךָ, and render "thou bringest more and more troops against me."—*x.* 22c is certainly "dittographed" from *v.* 22a (Bickell, Grätz).—*xi.* 12. Here Budde has contributed a valuable correction. Every one knows and has been puzzled by the words ascribed to Zophar in the Authorized Version,—

"For vain man would be wise, though man be born like a wild ass's colt,"

for which Davidson substitutes, without any dogmatism,—

"But an empty man will become wise,
When a wild ass colt is born a man,"—

¹ Render therefore,—

"His roots twine themselves together about a fountain,
He looks with delight on a luxuriance of fresh growths."

Budde however errs in excellent company. For יְהוּזָה he reads יְהוּזָה, for which Houbigant might have been cited. I find a pencil note of my own to the effect that this was also supported by Robertson Smith. Siegfried's יְהוּזָה (*LXX.*, Ἰηουζα) goes back to Cappellus; Grätz also accepts it. For my own part I still adhere to יְהוּזָה, which fits in with מְשֹׁשֵׁת דָּרְכּוֹ (*v.* 19).

remarking that Zophar adds further brilliancy to his picture of God's omniscience by contrasting it with the brutishness of man. Budde however separates *v.* 12 from the preceding description, and makes it an introduction to the encouraging address to Job in *vv.* 13-19. No one should take too hopeless a view of his fellow-man. "Even the most senseless man may come to understanding, and even a wild ass colt may be tamed." He omits אָדָם, "man," which may have come in from Gen. xvi. 12, and corrects יוֹלֵד, "is born," into יִלְמָד, "is tamed." Grätz comes very near this with his suggestion יִלְכָד, "is taken"; and since Budde has not quite justified the word יִלְבָּב (in *a*), I would propose to correct יִלְבָּב into יִלְמָד, and יוֹלֵד into יִלְכָד, thus obtaining the excellent sense (I reproduce the assonance of the Hebrew),—

"But (even) senseless man may be taught,
And a wild ass colt may be caught."

The result is quite defensible palæographically, and is an acquisition not only to the exegete, but, may I not add? to the religious teacher.

Completeness in a review of this sort is, for reasons of space, impossible. I therefore leap to xix. 25-29, upon which Budde has bestowed great and not ineffectual pains. No one can be indifferent to the fate of this famous passage, which introduces one of the most solemn services in the Prayer-Book, and which in the German Revised Version (a work marked by considerable caution) runs thus: "For I know that my redeemer lives; and as the last he will arise above the dust; and after this my skin has been smitten to pieces, without my flesh I shall see God, etc." The English Revised Version, it is true, retains "from my flesh," but places "without my flesh" in the margin. Here is one grave question to settle. If "from my flesh" is wrong, it would seem to be the duty of the Church of England to

substitute the right rendering, and so harmonize the statement of the old Hebrew poet with that of the apostle in 1 Cor. xv. 36, 37, 49, 50.¹ For my own part, I agree with Budde in preferring the rendering "from my flesh," and I think that he might have expressed his opinion with rather more decision. For, as Dr. Charles Taylor has shown (*Journal of Philology*), there is no complete parallel for the rendering "without my flesh" for מִבְּשָׂרִי,² in connection with אֶהְיֶה. But the question is not a simple one. The LXX. translator evidently found in the passage the doctrine of the resurrection of the body, and it is very possible that, though he may have added definiteness to the reference, he did but proceed on the path which an earlier student had marked out. The analogy of several passages in the Psalms favours this view, and in spite of Budde's very attractive exegesis,³ the form of the Massoretic text strongly suggests that the passage xix. 25-29 has passed through more than one phase. Bickell and Siegfried both go too far for me in their "restorations," but I cannot share Budde's confidence in the present text. This is how he renders it, permitting himself a few very moderate corrections,—

"But I know (that) my Goel lives,
 And as a last one will arise on the dust,
 And behind my skin which has been thus mangled,
 Yea, out of my flesh I shall see God;
 Whom I shall see favourably inclined to me,
 And mine eyes will behold, and not as a stranger,—
 The reins in my body faint (with longing).
 When ye say, 'How we will persecute him!
 The root of the matter we will find in him,'

¹ Cf. Spitta's reverently meant proposal for a modification of the words of J. M. Bach's Choralmotette, "Ich weiss, dass mein Erlöser lebt," *Monatschrift für Gottesdienst*, 1896, pp. 59 ff.

² Neither of the two passages of Job quoted by Dillmann and Budde (xi. 15, xxi. 9) is quite in point; indeed, in xi. 15, כְּפִיּוֹם is a corruption of כְּמִיּוֹם in v. 15b, which has intruded into the text (Bickell, Beer).

³ Budde himself recognises that there is a serious corruption in v. 26, though he does not attribute this to doctrinal influences.

Be afraid because of the sword,
 For the like are offences for the sword,
 That ye may find out, 'There is a judge.'

The first two and the last four of this passage are very plausibly translated, and the justification of the new readings is perhaps adequate. At any rate, I have no mind to dispute about them with the learned and acute author. But I am very sure that *מבשרי* in line 4 is wrong, and that this false reading has led to the insertion of lines 5 and 6.¹ For *מבשרי*, we should most probably read with Merx *מִשְׁדֵי* (LXX., *παρὰ κυρίου*), *i.e.*, "from Shaddai." In line 3 *נִקְפֹּי־זֹאת* has probably sprung out of *נִקְפֹּי־תִי*, "I am shrivelled up" (see Beer, *ap.* Budde), and this again out of *נִקְמַתִי*, or *נִדְקַתִי*. The reading *עוֹרִי*, "my skin," was presumably influenced by *בְּשָׂרִי*, "my flesh" (*cf.* *v.* 20); *וְאָחַר* (not expressed in LXX.) seems written by an error of the eye, such as often occurs, owing to *וְאָחֲרוֹן* in the previous line. We are therefore perfectly free in dealing with *וְאָחַר*, but less so in correcting *עוֹרִי*; for the true word ought not to be very dissimilar to *עוֹרִי*. One expects for *v.* 26 something like this,—

"And my righteousness shall come forth as the light,
 And through Shaddai I shall see his redemption."²

But the care which Budde has bestowed both on the text and on the exegesis deserves cordial recognition. He is very confident of the general accuracy of his view, has apparently no misgivings as to the rendering "behind my skin" = "while still enclosed by my skin," and finds

¹ The second *אָחֲזָה* (*v.* 27) is one very suspicious point.

² *וַיֵּצֵא כְּאוֹר צִדְקָתִי וּמִשְׁדֵי אֲחִזָּה נִאֲדָיו* in Mas. text looks rather like a corruption of *וַיֵּצֵא כְּאוֹר צִדְקָתִי וּמִשְׁדֵי אֲחִזָּה נִאֲדָיו = נִאֲדָיו*, *cf.* Isa. lxiii. 4. According to my arrangement, Job's great declaration falls into a pentastich and a tetrastich (*v.* 25 correct possibly as it stands, *v.* 26 needing correction, *vv.* 28 and 29 needing slight corrections, and the excision of the last line, "That ye may know," etc.).

nothing extraordinary in the expression “(from) out of my flesh I shall see God.” As to the time when this vision of God shall be granted to the embodied spirit of Job, he thinks (with all modern Protestant critics) that it must be before Job’s death; and since Job expects his death within a few years at most (xvi. 22), the revelation of God cannot be far distant. And certainly, if the text has been correctly read and rendered by Budde, this view of the time of that great favour must be correct.

No less care has been bestowed on other disputed chapters. Siegfried thinks that xxiv. 13-24 is one of a series of interpolations made in the interests of the orthodox doctrine of retribution. Bickell, that vv. 5-24 is a passage from some other poem in a different metre from the true Job, which has taken the place of about seven lost stanzas. Dillmann admits that vv. 13-17 and vv. 18-24 have been doubted by Merx upon grounds which deserve consideration. Budde too grants that in its present form the chapter is very difficult to comprehend. But he thinks that the text can be greatly improved by emendation, and that a few interpolations have to be recognised. It is very evident that here, as throughout the second part of our Book of Job, Budde’s textual criticism is on the whole sounder than that of Bickell. There is still room, however, for discussion, especially as to the details, and it should be noted that Budde’s willingness as a text-critic to learn from others has helped him quite as much as his own talent.

Chap. xxviii. presents more attractive problems. The first part gives us our only information as to mining in or near Palestine; the second is a fine rhetorical but deeply felt declaration of the inaccessibility of all wisdom but the fear of God. The connection of this passage with its context is by no means obvious, and the elaborateness of the description in both parts is surprising in a speech of the afflicted Job. Both Bickell and Budde however are very

unwilling to assign it (as a later insertion) to another poet, and this unwillingness has sharpened their eyes as textual critics. Budde omits no fewer than eighteen stichi, and Bickell (assisted by the LXX.) even more. I cannot think that, from his own point of view, Budde's abridgment is sufficient. It would be more plausible to omit in the first part all but *vv.* 1-3*b* (*i.e.* as far as חִלְקֵר); I do not say that it would be correct.

With a mere glance at Budde's unsatisfactory view of xxix. 18, of which I will venture to speak elsewhere, and his brilliant suggestion for xxix. 21-25, I hasten on to the speeches of Elihu, which our author, strange to say, regards as an integral part of the original poem. About 23 verses are rejected as interpolations, and not a few corrections are made in the text. The speeches gain considerably by the alterations, which I am myself generally able to accept (in xxxvii. 22 for זָהָב read זָהָר, and so do with less help from archæology). More interest, however, attaches to the speeches of Jehovah. Here again the corrections are often excellent. As elsewhere, Budde does justice to a too much neglected English scholar, Bateson Wright (see *e.g.* on xxxviii. 27, xxxix. 18). His own correction, נִבְעִי for נִבְכִי, in xxxviii. 16 is very good (but נִבְעֵי would surely be better). Special care has been devoted to the descriptions of Behemoth and Leviathan, and it would be ungrateful not to admit that the text has on the whole benefited. Still I have an uneasy feeling that the difficulties have not always been resolutely met. For instance, the correctness of the first line of xl. 20 is not perfectly clear to me. As commonly explained, it is not in parallelism to the second, and, as Budde himself points out, the preceding line (which, as the particle כִּי, "for," at the head of *v.* 20 shows, was closely connected with *v.* 20*a*, and might have assisted us in interpreting or correcting it) is corrupt. As to *v.* 19, I admit that from Budde's point of view it is beyond correc-

tion. But those who do not share his objections to certain newer lights (see Part II. of this article) will, I think, agree that לְיָשַׁר הַרְבּוֹת הָעֵשׂוּי ("which is made to be prince of dry places") is a form of text out of which both our existing readings הַעֲשׂוּ יִגְשׁוּ חֲרָבוֹ (Mas. text) and הָעֵשׂוּי לְשַׁחַק בּוֹ (presupposed by LXX.) can easily have arisen.¹ Thus the second line of *v.* 19 will correspond with the poet's last words on Leviathan in xli. 26*b*. Even if xli. 4–26 be a later insertion (of which I am by no means convinced) the correspondence need not be accidental. On xli. 1–3 see Part II.

Once more, the reader is intreated not to suppose that these criticisms are meant unfavourably. Books like Job may be compared to paintings which skilled hands endeavour to restore to their original beauty. Some may prefer that the paintings should be allowed to fade—a sad fate, but better than that of a misinterpretation, which misrepresents and so perverts the artist's work. But no such objection can be made to corrections such as those of Budde and his colleagues. For the traditional text is ever with us, and we can always go back to it if we will. Nor can we avoid the attempt to correct the text, for this is a necessary aid to critical and exegetical work.

I conclude with a specimen of Budde's translation. The passage is the description of Behemoth (xl. 15–24). In Part II. of this article I shall find occasion to refer to it,—

"Lo, the hippopotamus which I made with thee;
 Grass, like the ox, doth he eat.
 Lo, his might is in his loins,
 And his strength in the muscles of his belly;
 He stiffeneth his tail like the cedar,
 The sinews of his thighs are firmly knotted;
 His bones are tubes of brass,
 His spine is like a bar of iron.
 He is the firstling of the ways of God;

* * * * *

¹ לְיָשַׁר may have been written 'חֲרָבוֹ' (*i.e.*, with a mark of abbreviation after ו). So Gunkel; cf. Perles, *Analekten*.

For (their) fruit must mountains bring him,
 While all the beasts of the field sport themselves there.
 Under lotus trees lieth he down,
 In cover of reed and fen,
 Hedged in by shady lotus trees,
 Surrounded by willows of the brook.
 Though the stream sink,¹ he heedeth not;
 Light-hearted is he when it² gusheth up to his mouth,
 Who³ will seize him by the teeth,⁴
 And pierce his⁵ nose with a snare?"

T. K. CHEYNE.

THE PLACE OF THE CROSS IN THE WORLD.

(REVELATION XIII. 8.)

THERE have been two extreme views of the destiny of this world—optimism and pessimism. The optimist looks upon all things as working for the highest good; the pessimist regards them as tending to the utmost evil. Neither can deny the presence of the sacrificial element in the existing system of things; but they differ as to the position which it holds. The pessimist looks upon the design of life as essentially malignant; everything in his view is constructed so as to bring man to a sense of his limitation and his nothingness; the cross is with him the goal. The optimist, on the other hand, regards the goal as individual happiness; but, before reaching the paradise of self-gratification, he holds that man has a dark avenue to tread either by way of discipline or by way of penalty; the cross is with him an interlude.

The representatives of these two tendencies are respectively the Brahmanic and the Jewish creeds. To the

¹ Reading ישקע for ישק.

² Omitting ירד.

³ Reading כמי הוא.

⁴ Reading בישניו.

⁵ Reading אפן.

former, the promise of life to the individual soul is a delusion, and by the crosses of life we learn that delusion. To the latter, the promise of individual happiness is a profound truth; we only want a little present restraint in order to prepare us for a life of unlimited indulgence. The Indian and the Jew, as representing the extreme wing of the Aryan and the Semitic races, have each expressed unqualifiedly their opposite reading of the problem of existence.

Now, the theory of Christianity is radically different from either of these; but the strange thing is that it reaches its difference by uniting the opposite elements of each. It agrees with the distinctive features of both systems. It agrees with the optimist in holding that all things work together for good—absolute good, final good. It agrees with the pessimist in holding that all things are constructed with the view of teaching the individual life its own impotence. How does it reconcile the statements? By the bold paradox that the highest good is sacrifice, and that the greatest happiness which can come to the individual is simply his despair of finding it in himself. Christianity joins the hands of the Brahman and the Jew. It declares with the Jew that good is the final goal; it affirms with the Brahman that the final goal is the cross. The thing which the Brahman repudiates as evil is the thing which the Christian eulogises as good. The Christian reaches his Messiah on the very road by which the Brahman reaches despair. The hell of the one has become the heaven of the other. Christianity has accepted the pessimist's facts, but it has built upon them the opposite inference. The one says, "I find life not worth living, because it is always crucifying the individual man." The other says, "I find life infinitely precious, because, in the crucifixion of the individual man, emerges his highest joy."

Now, in the passage before us we have a striking statement of this view. "The lamb slain from the foundation

of the world." St. John imagines himself standing at the beginning of creation. By a bold act of fancy he puts himself in the position of the Divine Artist. He says that at the foundation of the world the first thing seen was not the foundation, but the superstructure. When God was laying the first stone, He was not looking at the stone, but at the topmost tower. This, of course, is true of every artist. The thing last in execution is the thing earliest in contemplation; he would never begin his actual work if his inner eye did not first rest on the completed picture. The mystery of John's words does not lie in the fact that God saw the flower before the seed; every planter does the same. But when John goes on to tell us the object which God contemplated as the flower of creation, it is then that we are startled. *What* is here said to be the goal of creation as it appeared in the sight of the Divine Artificer? He is laying a physical basis, which as yet is very chaotic and imperfect; should we not expect that His inner eye would rest on the completing and perfecting of the physical? On the contrary it rests on the collapse of the physical altogether, on an act of sacrifice by which the outward form is crucified and the bodily life suspended. The Lamb is said to have been slain from the foundation of the world. It was not the result of an accident; it was not the result of an emergency; it was something involved in the plan of the creation itself, a part of its purpose, a design of its being. Its first stone was laid with a view to the development of the sacrificial life.

Was St. John then an optimist, or a pessimist? In the worldly sense of these words he was something different from either, and something which admitted a truth in both. On the one hand he holds with the worldly optimist that all things do work for the highest good; the universe is to him the product of love. But on the other hand, just because it is the product of love, he could never admit that it

is a field for self-gratification. It is essential to his idea of the world that it should be a disappointment to self-gratification. He would have endorsed the whole Indian indictment against life as a medium of individual indulgence. The glory of life to him was just that it did not admit of individual indulgence. He found in it a sphere that, from the beginning to the end of the day, disappointed every selfish hope, wrecked every ship that sailed only for its own cargo. And why so? Because to him the essence of God was love. The highest good of any world must be to be made in the image of its Creator. If God be love, the highest good must be to be made in the image of love. St. John asked himself how that could be done on the Greek principle of self-indulgence, or the Jewish principle of a physical Messiah. He felt that if the end of life were simply to wear purple and fine linen, and fare sumptuously every day, and if life itself were amply suited to such an end, then life was incompatible with love. He felt that to make it compatible with love it must be restricted from the liberty of a Greek or Hebrew paradise—denuded of much of the purple, stripped of much of the fine linen, reduced in the amount of its sumptuous faring. This world, in short, is to St. John a development, and an upward development; but it is a development of self-sacrifice. The Apocalypse has been called a sensuous book; it is to my mind the least sensuous-book in the Bible. It describes the process of the ages as a process of self-surrender. The very joy of the New Jerusalem is said to be a joy which springs from the sacrificial spirit. If they hunger no more, neither thirst any more, it is not because they are surfeited with outward plenty; it is because the Lamb in the midst of the throne has led them, because in the power of self-forgetfulness their own burden has dropped in the sea.

This, then, is the meaning of the passage, "The Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." It means that

Christ was all along the goal of creation, and that all creation is a making for Christ. More particularly, it means that the line of this world's progress has been a development of self-sacrifice. It seems to me that in this last point the writer of the Apocalypse has come nearer to a philosophy of history than all who went before him. If you take any other line of progress, you will fail, in my opinion, to prove that there has been an advance in the march from the old to the new. Shall we take intellect? Do we feel that the amount of mind force is greater in the modern Englishman than it was in the ancient Greek? It would be difficult to feel it, and it would be impossible to prove it: are Plato and Aristotle inferior to the best intellects among us? Shall we take imagination? Are we not becoming impressed with the notion that the old age of the world is unfavourable to art? Have we reached the architectural conception which planned the pyramids? Have we outrun the triumphs of Greek sculpture? Have we surpassed the poetry of Homer? Have we sustained the fame of the mediæval painters? Still less here I think can we boast of progress. But, you say, What of invention, mechanical discovery, the application of the forces of nature to the needs of man? Surely here there is a field where our advance cannot be disputed. Yes; I grant it. But have you ever considered how much of this invention is itself due to the spread of the unselfish principle? Why have the great ages of discovery been the ages after Christ? Is it not just because Christ has been before them? Is it not because the spirit of sacrifice has awakened man to the wants of man? The times of self-seeking were not the times of invention. As long as a man had no interest in any country but his own, he made no effort to facilitate the course of travelling. The increased provision for locomotion has been the result of a demand—the demand of man for man. It has come from the breaking of limits—

not only of individual but of national limits. It has sprung from the sense of brotherhood, from the increasing conviction that it is not good for the man to be alone. It is therefore an effect and not a cause. It is not a source of progress; it is the result of a progress springing from another source. What that source is, it leaves us still to inquire.

And if we do inquire, I think we shall find that St. John has put his hand upon the one thing in the world which is progressive. It is not intellect. It is not imagination. It is not even invention; that is the result of altruism. It is altruism itself—the inability of the individual to live for his own interest. St. John says creation is moving toward a type—a lamb slain, and it is moving toward that type in a straight line—the line of sacrifice. It is climbing to its goal by successive steps which might be called steps downward—increasing limitations of the self-life. “The Lamb slain from the foundation” means “the Lamb slain *in* the foundation.” It is really an assertion of the fact that sacrifice is bound up in the constitution of nature, that the law of sacrifice is the law of nature, and that progress in the power to sacrifice is progress in the life of nature.

To what extent did St. John see this? He had much less evidence for it than a man has now; that is just what proves his inspiration. He anticipated a truth before it was demonstrated. He was too young for the eye of science; but just by reason of his youth he had the eye of poetry. He looked into the face of nature as the child looks into the fire—to see forms there. He saw in visible nature a series of gospel pictures; everything seemed to live only by losing itself. He saw the waves of the sea of Patmos passing into waves of light; he beheld the waves of light passing into eddies of the sea. It seemed to him that even in that lonely spot God had inscribed upon the walls of nature the image of a cross. By-and-by, before the

eyes of the seer there flashed a higher order of creation, and it was clothed in the same garb—the robe of sacrifice. He passed from the pictorial representation of sacrifice in nature to its actual, though involuntary, representation in animal life. The very reference to a slain lamb is a reference to an animal sacrifice. The shedding at the altar of the lower creatures' blood must, to the gentle mind of St. John, have presented the same problem of pain which presses on the modern mind as what is called the survival of the fittest. How did St. John reconcile himself to that spectacle of an involuntary sacrifice of the animal life prescribed by the Old Testament? He said it was a type of Christ. We in modern times smile at the naïve answer. Yet it may be questioned if, from any theistic point of view, a better can be found. If sacrifice be the law of the highest being, it is desirable to reach it. You can only reach anything by a repeated experience of it. The first experience of everything must be unconscious. Life itself is unconscious at the beginning; so in general is love. What is Mr. Herbert Spencer's account of the origin of conscience? He says it began with compulsion; one generation did good deeds from fear, and the next did them from habit. Is it not as reasonable to hold that sacrifice became voluntary from first being experienced involuntarily? The lower forms have been made to yield to lives more fit for the universe, and by their yielding they have made these lives fitter still. They have propagated something—something which to them was a painful necessity, but which to the generation to come was to be a stimulus and a joy. They have transmitted to posterity the battlefield on which they themselves have died, and, in the act of transmitting it, they have transformed the field of battle into a garden of roses.

In man that garden bursts into bloom. How, we need not here inquire. Some say it grew out of the animal;

others, with whom I agree, that it required an added force. Be this as it may, all are willing to admit that one side of our nature is allied to the life below. That which has burst into flower is the thing which originally dropped blood. What is it that has produced the change? It is the advent of a power called love. St. John in this very book has the image of a woman rushing with her child into the wilderness to protect it from a dragon. This shows there passed before him the natural sacrifices of the human heart. There is, in my opinion, as much sacrifice of life in man as there is in the animal creation. I believe that the cares of the heart prevent every man from living the full amount of his natural years. What is the difference, then, between the sacrifice of the animal and the sacrifice of the man? It is an inward difference; the obligatory has become the voluntary. What has made it voluntary? It is love, a force to which in the animal world nothing exactly corresponds, a force which adds to the sacrifice, and at the same time helps to bear it. It has increased at once the burden and the lever, the weight and the wing, the suffering and the power of sustenance; it has for the first time made the cross a crown.

And yet, merely natural love is far from having reached the goal. It is noble; it is beautiful; but it is not the topmost triumph. For, what after all is that which it seeks? Simply the survival of that which it deems the fittest—the nearest to itself. In all its natural forms love seeks its own. The mother's love, the brother's love, the husband's love, the son and daughter's love, are each and all the search for something kindred to ourselves. St. John looks out for a vaster type—a love that can come where there is no kindred, no sympathy. He seeks a love that shall strive for the survival of the unfittest—the blood of a spotless soul that can wash the sins of the absolutely impure. He seeks such a love as Paul sought in 1 Corin-

thians xiii., whose every step was a step downwards, a step into hearts foreign to its own—believing against present facts, hoping against existing clouds, bearing against daily disappointments, enduring against labour seemingly thrown away. This is to John the perfect type of altruism—the Lamb that was slain.

It is the progress towards this type that constitutes to St. John the philosophy of history. The world, he would say, is made for Christ, and therefore it is not a perfect world. It is not suited to the satisfaction of man—either his physical or his mental satisfaction. It cribs and narrows his individual life at every corner, because it is made for another life than the individual. It breaks the unity of the family, because it wants man to look further than the family. It interrupts the peace of the tribe, because it desires man to see beyond the tribe. It destroys the boundaries of the nation, because it would stimulate man to a wider altruism than even the life of the patriot—an altruism which shall seek elements foreign to itself, and find a place in its heart for every country and kindred and people and tongue. “Behold He cometh with clouds,” is John’s summary of the purpose of creation. The clouds are made to rest upon everything with a local colouring, just that man may gaze upon that which is not local—that every eye may see Him.

GEORGE MATHESON.

THE CENSUS OF QUIRINIUS.

II.

AT this stage there is a point which requires careful notice. The regular ancient custom, when any important event was taken as an era, seems to have been to call the current year in which that event occurred the year 1. It was not the custom to institute a new kind of year beginning from the event in question. The years continued to run as before; and the numbering began with the year in which occurred the event commemorated. For example, the battle of Actium, which was in many places taken as an era, occurred on 2nd September, 31 B.C.; and at Amisos in Pontus, the year 1 ended on 23rd September, 31 B.C.¹ Now if Augustus's assumption of tribunician power on 27th June, B.C. 23, was the beginning of the *census*-periods, as our theory is,² it follows that in a country where the year began on 1st January, the year 1 would be 23 B.C., and the first year of the next *census*-period would be 9 B.C.; and in a country where the year began on 23rd September (as was the case in many parts of the Greek world) or on 29th August (as was the case in Egypt), the year 1 would be

¹ This fact is now accepted: M. Imhoof Blumer in *Zeitschrift für Numismatik*, 1896, p. 257, quotes for it his *Griech. Münzen*, p. 33, my *Histor. Geogr.*, pp. 194, 441, and Kaestner *de Aenis*. See also Kubitschek in Pauly-Wissowa, *s.v. Aera*. In Syrian Antioch coins of the year 29 mention both the XII. consulship and the XIII. consulship (January 2 B.C.) of Augustus; and therefore the year 29 corresponds to B.C. 3-2. The year 1, therefore, was B.C. 31-30, showing that either the Antiochian year began earlier than 2nd September, or the era was reckoned not from the day of battle, but from some subsequent event affecting Antioch specially.

² In support of the statement, p. 278, that any important device of organization, especially in Egypt, would be likely to emanate from Augustus, Dr. Plummer refers to Tacitus, *Ann.*, ii. 57, and *Hist.*, i. 11, in which the jealousy with which Augustus and Tiberius kept everything in their own hands respecting Egypt is noted. The strictness with which Tiberius restricted himself to following out the ideas of Augustus is familiar to all.

24-23 B.C., and the first of the next *census*-period would be 10-9 B.C. It was only in a country where the year began in the spring¹ that the year 1 would be 23-22 B.C., which in the preceding article was taken as the first of the *census*-period. That fact seemed to point to the conclusion that the *census*-periods originated, not in a general regulation for the whole empire, but in a local regulation for a country such as southern Syria, where the year began in spring. This was an embarrassing fact; and therefore I was careful to use on p. 285 and elsewhere a very guarded form of words in view of the conclusion towards which I was working, and which was to be stated in this article.

A timely communication of Rev. A. Wright, Queen's College, Cambridge, pointing out that I had been guilty of an arithmetical error,² relieved me from this embarrassment; and, though it is not a pure pleasure to find out one's errors, yet any pain I felt in having made such a strange mistake³ was immediately swallowed up in the pleasure of recognising that the corrected numbers suit my theory better. The first year was B.C. 23 in Italy and the more thoroughly Romanized provinces of the West, and 24-23 in Egypt and many eastern provinces; the next *census*-period had as its initial year 9 in the West, and 10-9 in the East; the rest were as already stated. Here we have a system that suits the prevailing customs of the empire; the fundamental fact would be that the initial years were 23, 9 B.C., 6 A.D., etc., according to the Roman year; and I should have expressed the former article in this simpler form, instead of in the more complicated double form, had

¹ In the eastern provinces the Romans usually accepted the existing facts of society, and made little or no attempt to Romanize the institutions of the country.

² I apologise to Dr. Wilcken for the note on p. 278. He was right, and I was wrong. My warm thanks are due to Mr. Wright.

³ It arose from confusion between the Roman reckoning (including both first and last terms of a series), and the modern (including only one term).

I not been misled by the arithmetical error, which made me think that the facts did not suit the Roman year.

Further, as Dr. Wilcken has pointed out, the census was intended to include all children born in the initial year of the period, and hence the actual enumeration could not be made till the next year had begun. Hence the enumeration for the period whose first year was 10-9 B.C. could not begin until the year 9-8 (see p. 278).¹

There remain still several difficulties connected with the passage of Luke. But since the greatest of them has been eliminated, we may look forward with good hope to the growth of knowledge clearing up the rest. Two may here be noticed.

I. The first *census* should be taken B.C. 9-8; but that year certainly does not suit Luke's description, for Sentius Saturninus came to govern Syria in 9 B.C., and was in Syria certainly during 8 B.C. Now, if a *census* had begun in 9 B.C., how can Luke pointedly call the *census* under Quirinius the first? We answer that it was reckoned as the application of the first *census*-period to Palestine. For some reason the *census* of 9 B.C. was not carried out in Palestine in that year. This may have been due to the practical difficulties of carrying out the enumeration in an Oriental country; these difficulties must have been great, especially when the idea was quite novel. Moreover, it is highly probable that Herod himself was not very eager to carry out the *census*, which brought his realm more definitely under the Romans than he would like. He visited Rome in the latter part of 8 B.C.,² and in 7 B.C. he fell into disgrace with Augustus, and his independence was curtailed by some sharp regulations on the part of the

¹ The two sentences at the top of p. 280 introduce an extraneous subject, and should not have been intruded into the discussion.

² These dates are probable; but except when a coin or inscription attests a date (as in the case of Varus), it is rarely certain to a year in that period and country.

Emperor. We must gather from Luke that Augustus insisted on the *census* being carried out in Herod's dominions, and that this at last was done while Quirinius was governor. Now, according to Tacitus, *Hist.*, v. 9, Quintilius Varus was governing Syria during the disturbances that followed the death of Herod in 4 B.C., and it cannot reasonably be supposed that Tacitus erred on this point. Varus, therefore, remained in Syria at least as late as the summer of 3 B.C., and he had come to Syria not later than the summer of 6 B.C.¹ Further, the government of Quirinius is universally placed later than that of Quintilius Varus. Is it possible that the *census* was postponed so late as the year 3-2 B.C.?

According to Luke, the census in Judæa was in progress before Herod died in 4 B.C.;² and our previous results have shown that, if any *census* took place before the "great census" of 6 A.D., it is likely not to have been postponed much after 7 B.C. What evidence, then, exists to show what was the period when Quirinius governed Syria for the first time? His second governorship of Syria, as is agreed on the clear evidence of Josephus, began in A.D. 6. With regard to the facts of his life between his consulship, 12 B.C. and that year, it is not possible to fix any date with precision: we have nothing better than probabilities to go on. It is certain that in this interval the following events occurred: his first governorship of Syria with the war in which he conquered the Homonadenses, thereafter his governorship of Asia, and, probably still later, his tutorship of Cæsar in Armenia and his marriage to Aemilia Lepida. With regard to the dates of these events, the following

¹ Coins of Antioch mention him as governor in the years 25, 26, and 27, *i.e.*, 7-5 B.C. Varus was, therefore, governor of Syria during parts at least of the three years from Sept. 7-Sept. 4 B.C.; *i.e.*, he came to Syria not later than summer 6 (according to the usual season of arrival and departure).

² The current date is accepted here as immaterial for our immediate purpose; but it is not intended to decide the question whether Herod died in the year 5-4 or 4-3 B.C.

statements are probably true, though hardly one of them is absolutely certain, and some are far from certain.

As to the governorship of Asia, it is quite certain that Cn. Lentulus Augur held that office in B.C. 2-1, and probable that he also held it in B.C. 1-A.D. 1.¹ It is highly probable that M. Plautius Silvanus governed Asia in A.D. 1-2,² and Marcius Censorinus 2-3, dying in office in the latter year. Further, Asinius Gallus governed Asia in B.C. 6-5. There remain open for Quirinius's proconsulate the years 5-2 B.C. and 3-6 A.D.

But, further, we know that in A.D. 20 Quirinius prosecuted his former wife, Aemilia Lepida, on a charge of attempting to poison him and of other misconduct; and it is mentioned as a fact which roused general sympathy that he brought this accusation "after twenty years" (*post vicensimum annum*). The precise force of this expression is obscure; but it may fairly be taken as a rough estimate from the marriage to the trial.³ Now the marriage did not take place until the death of Lucius Cæsar (to whom Lepida had been betrothed) on 20th August, A.D. 2; probably the marriage with Quirinius took place in the same year; the trial, then, occurred in the nineteenth year afterwards (according to Roman reckoning), which would justify Suetonius's rough estimate of the time. We conclude on Suetonius's authority, therefore, that Quirinius was in Rome in the end of A.D. 2; and as he was sent to act as tutor to Gaius Cæsar in Armenia, when Lollius, the

¹ Lentulus was in office on May 10, B.C. 1, which, as Mommsen points out, shows that he governed in the year B.C. 2-1 (*Res Gest. D. Aug.*, p. 170, *Prosopographia Romana*, s.v.). Further, Waddington is probably right in inferring from CIG 2943 that Lentulus was still in office on Aug. 12 in that year, and therefore governed B.C. 1-A.D. 1.

² See Zippel, *Röm. Herrschaft in Illyrien*, p. 13, Mommsen, *loc. cit.*

³ Mr. Furneaux (and apparently Nipperdey) take the interval as reckoned from the divorce to the trial. This suits the Latin order in Suetonius better; but is tacitly rejected by Mommsen and others as contrary to common sense and the general circumstances of the case.

previous tutor, died in that year, we may suppose that these two great honours, which associated him so closely with the imperial family, were bestowed on him together at the close of A.D. 2. He doubtless remained in Armenia with Gaius, until the latter, being seized with illness from the effects of a wound, returned towards Italy, and died on the Lycian coast on 21st February, A.D. 4.

Now, when we consider that the consuls of the years 11, 10, and 8 B.C., had all held the proconsulship of Asia before the year 3 B.C., and that less distinguished men, consuls in 14 and 8 B.C., governed Asia in 2 B.C. and 1 A.D., it is highly improbable that Quirinius's government of Asia was postponed so late as 4-5 A.D. : the interval of sixteen years between consulship and Asian proconsulship is unexampled at that time.¹

We conclude, then, that Quirinius probably governed Asia in some year in the interval 5-2 B.C., *i.e.* not later than 3-2 B.C. and his first Syrian governorship in that case could not be later than 4-3 B.C. But, as we have seen, Varus governed Syria B.C. 6-3; and, according to Josephus, he succeeded Saturninus, who came to Syria in 9 B.C. No interval remains for Quirinius, except on one of two suppositions. (1) Did Josephus omit Quirinius by mistake, owing to the fact that he, governing Syria 7-6 B.C., was entirely occupied by the Homonadensian war, and never appeared in Southern Syria? This is a view which seems contrary to sound method, and to have nothing in its favour. (2) Was there a temporary arrangement in Syria similar to that which was instituted in Africa by the Emperor Caligula; *viz.*, that the command of the army with a view to the Homo-

¹ *L' intervalle sous Auguste parait avoir été généralement de cinq à six ans* (Waddington, *Fastes*, p. 12). The interval was thirteen years in the case of Cn. Lentulus Augur; but this is unique in that age.

nadensian war was entrusted to Quirinius, while the peaceful administration was committed to Quintilius Varus? This, certainly, is a rather violent supposition,¹ but it is clear that the Homonadensian war, in the remote north-west corner of the vast province, would monopolize the energies of the general for a long time. The importance attached to the war by the Romans appears from the fact that two supplications were voted on account of the success, and triumphal ornaments were awarded to Quirinius.² It seems, therefore, not impossible that in B.C. 6 or 5, Quirinius was sent to administer the Syrian armies, and conduct the great war, while Varus, who had been already in office for a year, was continued as peaceful administrator: the serious business connected with the Judæan kingdom, where Herod (as we have seen), was rather discontented and estranged, seemed to demand the continued close surveillance of Varus, who therefore was retained with authority over the province in everything except military matters. Finally we must understand that on the conclusion of the war the extraordinary power delegated to Quirinius ceased, and he returned to Rome (or went to govern Asia), while Varus remained in Syria until B.C. 3.

Why, then, did Luke name Quirinius in place of Varus, when the latter was more immediately connected (on our supposition) with Judæan affairs? In the first place, we notice that on our supposition, the mention of Quirinius gives a more definite date than the mention of Varus; and Luke's object in mentioning the governor is simply to give a date according to the usual style of ancient dating. Further, the subject is too obscure to make it possible to

¹ Similar suggestions have been made by two German scholars, but not in a form consistent with Roman usage or supported by really parallel cases.

² As he was only *legatus*, a triumph could not be granted to him.

answer every question. Whatever view is adopted, difficulties and unanswerable questions remain.

For those who adhere to the generally accepted dating of Quirinius' first Syrian governorship between 3 and 1 B.C., the supposition which would be most natural and easy is that *Κυρινίου* is an error for *Κυντιλίου*¹; because it is obvious that Luke's narrative demands a date under Herod, and Quintilius Varus governed at least from 6 B.C. till after the death of that king. This error might be explained in several ways. (1) Luke might have made a slip as regards the name. (2) The likeness of the two names, and the fact that the "great census" had made Quirinius a far more familiar and important name in Palestine, might have caused an unintentional corruption of the text; but the fact that MSS. are unanimous is strong against this supposition. (3) There might have been deliberate and intentional alteration at an early date by editors, who, knowing about "the great census" under Quirinius in A.D. 6-8, and thinking that *Κυντιλίου* was a mere slip, corrected it to *Κυρινίου*. I have not acquired the right by sufficient study to hold views about the text of the Gospels; but, if the analogy of *Acts* can be applied to the third Gospel, continued study makes me more and more convinced that the text of *Acts* has been much exposed to deliberate and intentional alteration in details, sometimes by suppression, sometimes by addition, and sometimes by change of a word or words (implying editing of the text). But all these suppositions are less probable than our view.

In these remarks it is assumed that the famous and much discussed inscription of Tibur relates to Quirinius. That is probable, but, like most of the facts here stated, is not certain. We must at present be content with possibilities, and wait for the discovery of the inscription which will afford certainty. It is lamentable to think that

¹ The usual epigraphic form in Greek.

so little effort is being made to discover the lacking evidence, and that the inscriptions which might give us certainty on this and many similar points may at any moment be perishing for want of any eye and hand to copy them. It is certain that owing to the spread of what is called civilization, more inscriptions have perished in Asia Minor in the last fifty years than in several centuries previously; and we make no effort to save the knowledge that is daily perishing.

II. An objection which has been urged against the narrative of Luke ii. 1 ff. is that, even if a *census* were ordered by Augustus, it would not take place in the kingdom of Judæa; and if it did take place, there would be no need that Joseph or Mary should go up to Bethlehem. These objections are closely connected, and seem to me to be founded on an incorrect conception of the relation of such dependent kingdoms as that of Herod to the Roman Empire. The language which some modern writers use about Herod's kingdom would almost seem to imply that it was independent instead of being dependent. The intention of Augustus (and obviously of other Roman administrators) in instituting these dependent kingdoms is clearly indicated by Strabo¹ in describing the reason why Cilicia Tracheia was placed under the government of King Archelaus. A territory which was still not ripe for Roman provincial administration was made into a dependent kingdom as a preparatory step; the continuous rule of a king was believed to be more effective and to exercise a stronger compulsion upon an unruly and uncivilized race. But the dependent king was an instrument intended to prepare a race, too utterly alien to Roman ways, for the stage when it might be incorporated in a Roman province. In the Roman conception the dependent kingdoms formed part of the Roman world (what Luke calls *τὴν οἰκουμένην*);

¹ xiv., p. 671.

they paid tribute, as is mentioned expressly in many cases; and they therefore contributed to the strength of the empire. Herod seemed to Augustus to be acting in too independent a fashion about 8-7 B.C., and the reins were tightened rather sharply in consequence.¹ The numbering of the people was insisted on, in spite of Herod's natural reluctance to treat his kingdom as a part of the Empire.

May we not fairly regard the method of numbering as due to this reluctance on Herod's part? If he must hold a *census*, at least he might give it a national character by numbering according to tribes in the native and non-Roman style.² This would disguise from his subjects the true character of the *census*. In the circumstances, the mode of *census* described by Luke seems a perfectly natural and probable procedure.

Luke was, beyond doubt, acquainted with the Roman method of taking *census*; and, if he here described a non-Roman method as having been followed, he did so conscientiously and on authority. The very fact that the tribal method forms an essential part of the story seems to me to be a sign of truth: an inventor would have followed the familiar method of Roman *census*.

Further, this tribal method of numbering explains why no such serious disturbance was produced by it as resulted from the Roman numbering and valuation which took place in Quirinius's second Syrian administration. It was not felt as an entirely foreign and hateful thing, though doubtless it was as unpopular with the people as it was distasteful to Herod, and disapproved by them as much as David's numbering had been.

¹ γράφει πρὸς τὸν Ἡρώδη . . . ὅτι πάλαι χρώμενος αὐτῷ φίλῳ νῦν ὑπηκόῳ χρήσεται, Josephus, *Ant. Jud.*, xvi. 9, 3. Mr. Lewin, in his *Fasti Sacri*, has treated this episode excellently.

² There was an essential and inherent opposition between the national and the Roman spirit in all matters and in every subject land. Romanization meant denationalization.

The Egyptian records show that two distinct kinds of ἀπογραφή were practised regularly under the Empire. One was the numbering by households, in which the head of each household made a return of his whole household every fourteenth year for purposes of numbering and probably of conscription. The other was for the purpose of taxation. Wilcken, in the paper which lies at the foundation of this study, has drawn this distinction clearly. In Judæa "the first census" was of the former kind only, "the great census" was also of the second kind.

It may be added that the statement of Justin Martyr, that the birth of Christ can be ascertained "from the *apographai* which were made" (ἐκ τῶν ἀπογραφῶν τῶν γενομένων), seems to imply an idea on his part that periodical *census* were taken, and that the records were preserved and could be consulted by authorized persons; and we have seen that both these facts are true in all probability. Beyond this general idea, which springs from his own knowledge of the Roman system, Justin seems to have no information except what he got from Luke. He knows that the registers exist, and he takes the facts on Luke's authority, and refers for corroboration to the registers; but his words would be meaningless unless it were a matter familiar to all that the registers did exist and constituted a final and indisputable court of appeal.

W. M. RAMSAY.

WAS ST. PAUL MARRIED?

It is admitted that this question is a matter of small importance. Whether St. Paul was married or unmarried does not alter our opinion of his character, detract from his self-denying labours, or affect the nature of his writings, though it may be affirmed that if St. Paul was married he could hardly have surmounted those obstacles which he encountered in his apostolic career, or have made such toilsome and dangerous journeys by sea and by land. But although the importance of the question is confessedly small, yet it is not devoid of interest. Everything that relates to the life of the greatest of the apostles must be interesting, and surely a point of such moment as to whether he ever entered upon the married state is deserving of consideration. The only possible doctrinal importance that can be attached to it is that it may possibly affect the question regarding the celibacy of the clergy, and more particularly the question whether missionaries, set apart to carry the Gospel of Christ into heathen countries, and especially those who must lead a wandering life, might not better remain unmarried, that question being one of prudence, not of obligation. If the celibacy of St. Paul be proved, the Roman Catholic Church might have used the fact as an argument in favour of their peculiar views regarding the celibacy of the clergy, were it not that such an argument would be far more than counterbalanced by the universally acknowledged fact that St. Peter, on whose confession their church was built, and whose successors the Roman pontiffs affirm themselves to be, was a married man.

Different opinions regarding this question have been entertained in the Christian Church. The affirmative answer that St. Paul was married has been adopted by several theologians, though it must be admitted that they

who do so are in a small minority. Among the Fathers, so far as I am aware, Clemens Alexandrinus stands alone in maintaining St. Paul's married condition. Luther, from his genial disposition and love of domestic life, cannot conceive of St. Paul otherwise than as a married man, exhibiting all the virtues of a family life. Ewald, a theologian of high distinction, but one of the most fanciful German critics, adopts the same opinion. "Perhaps," he observes, "St. Paul was then (at the martyrdom of Stephen) some thirty years of age, and was probably at that time already married, or was already a widower after an early marriage; for we may infer from plain induction that he had married in early life, but that when he had entered upon his high vocation as an apostle, he remained a widower." What these *plain indications* are Ewald does not mention, but refers to his *Sendschreiber des Apostels Paulus*; and, in turning to that book, we find that he draws the inference that St. Paul was a widower from the statements made in 1 Corinthians vii.

But the great advocate of St. Paul's married state is Dean Farrar. With Ewald he thinks that St. Paul before the martyrdom of Stephen was a married man, but that he had become a widower before he entered upon his great apostolic career. He assigns several reasons for this opinion. There are, he thinks, several statements pervading his Epistles which indicate that St. Paul must have been a married man. His loving spirit, his intense sympathy, his remarks on marriage, lead us to infer that he knew from experience the tenderness of human love, which can only be fully experienced in the married state. "The deep and fine insight of Luther," he observes, "had drawn the conclusion that Paul knew by experience what marriage was, from the wisdom and tenderness which characterize his remarks respecting it. One who had never been married could hardly have written on the subject as he

has done, nor could he have shown the same profound sympathy with the needs of all and received from all the same ready confidence." Certainly many commentators draw precisely the opposite conclusion: that St. Paul rather deprecates marriage, and in certain circumstances commends celibacy. Dean Farrar also dwells on the high importance assigned to marriage among the Jews: that they regarded it almost as a moral obligation, and greatly favoured early marriages; so that the extreme probability is that St. Paul, who in early life was a strict observer of the customs of the Jews, would also embrace their views on this subject. But it is very evident that all these statements are precarious reasons, and that no argument can be based on them. The importance of marriage among the Jews has been exaggerated; and it is generally agreed that among the twelve apostles St. John at least remained unmarried.

But the great argument which Dean Farrar adduces in favour of the married state of St. Paul is derived from the fact that according to him it is plainly intimated, if not asserted, that St. Paul was a member of the Jewish Sanhedrim, taken in connexion with the assumption that it was essential that every one who was so should be married. The passage on which this statement is founded is Acts xxvi. 10, where we read: "I both shut up many of the saints in prison, having received authority from the chief priests, and when they were put to death I gave my vote against them." The words *κατήνεγκα ψήφον*, rendered in the Authorised Version "I gave my voice against them," and more correctly in the Revised Version "I gave my vote against them," denote, it is asserted, the vote of a judge. "*Κατήνεγκα ψήφον* can hardly," says Alford, "be taken *figuratively*, as many commentators, trying to escape the inference that the *νεανίας* Saul was a member of the Sanhedrim; but must be understood as testifying to *this*

very fact, however strange it may seem. He can hardly have been *less than* thirty when sent on his errand of persecution to Damascus." The same interpretation of this verse has been adopted by Bishop Wordsworth, Dean Plumptre, and Dean Spence, all of them affirming that the most natural meaning of these words is that St. Paul was a member of the Sanhedrim, and that in this capacity he gave his vote for the death of Stephen and the other Christian martyrs. "It would seem," says Bishop Wordsworth, "that Saul himself had been a member of the Sanhedrim, and took part in its judicial proceedings by hearing cases and voting upon them." Dean Plumptre observes: "The words show that St. Paul, though a young man, must have been a member of the Sanhedrim itself or of some tribunal with delegated authority." And, as also Dean Spence remarks, "'I gave my vote against them': Not, as Meyer and others take it, 'I assented to it at the moment of their being killed,' equivalent to *συνευδοκῶν* of chapter xxii. 20; but rather, 'when the Christians were being punished with death I was one of those who in the Sanhedrim voted for their death.'"

It has further been assumed that according to the statements of the Rabbins the members of the Sanhedrim must be married men, because such were supposed to be less inclined to cruelty, and more influenced by merciful feelings. But although this is strongly insisted upon by Dean Farrar, yet those divines above mentioned, who admit that St. Paul was a member of the Sanhedrim, do not assert that they presuppose that he must have been a married man. Thus Alford, in expounding 1 Corinthians vii. 8, asserts, "There can be no doubt from this that St. Paul never was married." The assumption that it was an essential qualification of a member of the Sanhedrim that he must be married is doubtful, and is only mentioned by the later Rabbins, and even those rabbinical writers who are

quoted insist not so much on the married state of the member of the Sanhedrim as that he should have a family; and we may confidently affirm that this did not apply to the Apostle Paul.

The negative answer, that Paul never was married, is the opinion adopted by the large majority of those who have studied the subject. The Fathers are practically unanimous on this point. Tertullian, Jerome, Epiphanius, and Chrysostom assert that Paul was unmarried. The only dissentient view is Clemens Alexandrinus in a passage quoted by Eusebius. "Clement," he observes, "gives a statement of those apostles who had wives. . . . Paul does not hesitate, in one of his Epistles, to mention his own wife, whom he did not take about with him, in order to expedite the ministry the better" (*Hist. Crit.*, iii. 20); see also Clem. Alex., *Strom.*, iii. 6. But this statement of Clement rests on a false interpretation of the words of St. Paul. The passage to which he refers is generally supposed to be Philippians iv. 3, "I beseech thee also, true yokefellow, help those women, for they have laboured with me in the gospel." The idea that by "true yoke-fellow" (*γνήσιε σύζυγε*) St. Paul addresses his own wife is extravagant. The word is masculine; it is uncertain who is alluded to, but it is a man, and not a woman.

The words *κατήνεγκα ψῆφον* do not, we think, assert or indicate that St. Paul was a member of the Sanhedrim, and that as a judge he gave his vote, but are to be taken metaphorically, which means that St. Paul approved of the death of the Christians, acquiesced in their death as an individual. At that time he was filled with such bitter hatred against the Christians that he fully coincided with the views of those who put them to death. The words denote merely approbation, not real participation. They are equivalent to *συνευδοκῶν τῇ ἀναίρεσει αὐτοῦ*, consenting to his death (*Acts* xxii. 20). "*ψῆφον καταφέρειν*," observes Lechler, "literally

to lay down the voting stone, is, as little as the German word 'beistimmen,' originally signifying the same thing, to be understood literally of a vote given by a judge as lawful assessor of the court, but expresses only moral assent and approval."

It is impossible to suppose that St. Paul could be a member of such an august body as the Sanhedrim, which numbered among its members the most influential men in Jerusalem—the chief among the Jews—taken both from the sect of the Pharisees and from the sect of the Sadducees. The Sanhedrim was composed of Jewish aristocrats; it was a purely aristocratic body. Besides, at the death of Stephen St. Paul is stated to have been a young man (Acts vii. 58); he could hardly have been thirty; and the members of the Sanhedrim were men of mature years. Nor was St. Paul a stated resident in Jerusalem. It is true that he studied under Gamaliel, but he must have left the city after his educational course was finished, for it is almost certain that he was not there during the ministry of our Lord, and that he had never seen Christ in the flesh. It is extravagant to suppose that Paul, not a Hebrew, but a Hellenist by birth, a Jew of Tarsus, a comparative stranger in Jerusalem, and who does not appear to have belonged to any distinguished Jewish family, should at an early age take his seat among the high priests and principal men—the nobles of Judæa. It would be somewhat similar to an obscure foreigner, one who had lately come to London, being a member of the House of Lords. If, then, Paul was not, nor could have been, a member of the Jewish Sanhedrim, the chief reason insisted upon by Dean Farrar and others for affirming that Paul was married falls to the ground.

But especially, and what appears to decide the question, we have Paul's own declaration that he was unmarried. This statement occurs twice in the seventh chapter of First Corinthians—"I would that all men were even as myself,"

that is evidently unmarried. "But I say to the unmarried (*τοῖς ἀγάμοις*), it is good for them to abide even as I" (*ὡς καὶ γώ*), unmarried (1 Cor. vii. 7, 8). These words appear to be plain and positive statements on the part of St. Paul that he was unmarried. Indeed, almost all admit that he had no wife when he wrote those words.

Dean Farrar, however, following Ewald, finds an argument even from these words of the apostle in favour of his marriage. He asserts that St. Paul here classes himself, not among those who had never married, but among widowers. His words are: "1 Corinthians vii. 8 seems a distinct inference that he classed himself among *widowers*, for he says, 'I say, therefore, to the *unmarried* and widows, it is good for them if they abide (*μείνωσιν*) even as I.' That by the 'unmarried' he here means 'widowers'—for which there is no special Greek word—seems clear, because he has been already speaking, in the first seven verses of the chapter, to those who have never been married." But this is a forced interpretation. *Ἀγάμοις* denotes the unmarried generally of both sexes, whether man or woman, without distinction: not simply widowers, as is evident from the contrasted term *γεγαμηκόσιν*. The additional clause *καὶ ταῖς χήραις* does not justify a restrictive rendering; it merely signifies that he gives this advice not merely to the unmarried, but also to those who once were married; and the advice is that in present circumstances they should remain even as he, that is, unmarried. There is not the slightest intimation, either in the history of the Acts or in the Epistles, leading us to infer that St. Paul was a widower. Thus, then, taking all the circumstances into account, and giving the most natural interpretation to the words of Scripture, we come to the definite conclusion, without much, if any dubiety, that the Apostle Paul was never married,—that he was a celibate.

A NEW SECOND-CENTURY CHRISTIAN
DIALOGUE.

II.

Z. THOU didst promise to prove that Christ is both King and Priest.

A. Christ is anointed not with earthly oil, but with the Spirit of God, according to the prophecy of David, which says :¹ “ *Therefore God, thy God, anointed thee with oil of gladness above Thy fellows.*” But not “ according to Thy fellows ” is here ; because his fellows are anointed with earthly oil, but He with the Holy Spirit, as is written :² “ *The Spirit of the Lord is upon Me, wherefore He anointed even Me ; to preach good tidings to the poor He hath sent Me.*”

Z. It was Isaiah who said this? Surely Christ³ is not God? (or God is not Christ?)

A. Rather this, that which Isaiah said, he said in the person of Christ. Listen therefore to his entire prophecy that thou mayest know that the prophecy suits no one else, except Christ alone. For it says as follows :⁴ “ *The Spirit of the Lord is upon Me, wherefore He hath anointed even Me. *To evangelise the poor hath He sent Me,*⁵ to heal the broken in heart, to preach to the captives release and to the blind that they see, to proclaim a year acceptable to the Lord and a day of recompence to our God. To have mercy on all mourners, to give unto the mourners the glory of Sion ; instead of ashes, anointing of gladness ; and to the mourners a garb of gladness, instead of a spirit of heaviness. They shall be called a race of righteousness [212], a plant of the Lord, unto glory ; and they shall build and renew the cities laid waste, made desolate for generations [or of the Gentiles]. And*

¹ Ps. xlv. 7.

² Isa. lxi. 1.

³ Is not this a correction for a primitive “ Isaiah ”?—R. Harris.

⁴ Isa. lxi. 1.

⁵ One codex omits the words asterisked.

aliens shall come to shepherd thy sheep and foreigners [be thy] ploughmen and vine-dressers. But ye shall be called priests of the Lord; servants of our God shall ye be named, the powers of the Gentiles must ye devour and with their riches become wonderful. Thus shall they have the earth as a second heritage, and joy everlasting be upon their heads. For I am the Lord who love righteousness and hate robbery by injustice."

Z. All this is spoken concerning our congregation.

A. Joy everlasting has not been and is not now upon your heads.

Z. No one insults another by way of argument.

A. I do not insult thee; far be it from me to do so. But if thou canst prove to me that joy everlasting has been yours, whose very city and temple have been destroyed, and your government, and country, and ark, and holy of holies, and cherubin, and mercy-seat, then whatever thou hast learned, tell it forthwith.

Z. But all this is to be in the future, though the time is not yet.

A. Dost thou however thyself admit the anointing with the Holy Spirit, and that the prophecy of Isaiah has not been fulfilled in the case of a single one of the kings and prophets that have already been?

Z. Had then not Isaiah the Spirit?

A. He had the Holy Spirit of God, and not Isaiah alone but all the prophets of God [213]. But what I have just now cited from him, Isaiah spoke not about himself, but about another.

Z. And I say that He spoke about another, yet not about thy Christ.

A. Then the anointing of the Christ is allowed to be by the Holy Spirit?

Z. Yes.

A. Then go to Jerusalem, and learn by asking therein where the Holy Spirit descended, and upon whom, and

when, that thou mayest hear that it was in Jordan, [on Him] who was born of Mary, under Augustus Cæsar.

Z. And canst thou believe thy gospels?

A. Just because of this both the place is told thee and the time; so that thou mayest go to the spot and receive real proof, and assure thyself of the fulfilment of the prophecy in the case of all who believe in him, by beholding gladness everlasting on their heads whoever shall say,¹ “*The light of thy countenance hath been set as a sign on us, and thou hast given gladness to our hearts.*”

Z. That was said not concerning you Christians, but about us Israelites.

A. Listen to the sequel of the prophecy, that thou mayest know that it is spoken about us.

Z. Go on.

A. Thus :² “*And I will lay on them an everlasting covenant, and their seed shall be known among the heathen.*”

Z. The seed of the Jews was to be known among the heathen.

A. Thou speakest truly. For the holy apostles [214] being the seed of Abraham have been made known to us heathens; and their grandsons among the congregations³ are holy witnesses. For⁴ “*Every one who seeth them, knoweth them, that they are the seed blessed of the Lord, and they shall rejoice in the Lord with everlasting gladness.*”

Z. We have rejoiced in the Lord.

A. And again I say—your everlasting joy, what is it, when your land has been made a desert and your cities consumed with fire? Wherefore you should rather for ever mourn—yes or no? Tell me.

Z. But I have told you that it will be in the future, even for another city to be built.

¹ Ps. zv. 7.

² Isa. lxi. 8.

³ Cp. Hegesippus *ap.* Euseb., *H. E.*, bk. iii., chaps. 20 and 32 [V. Bartlett].

⁴ Isa. lxi. 9.

A. Let us then see the sequel that [the things foretold in it] have not happened [to you Jews]. For it says this¹: “*My soul shall rejoice in the Lord, for He hath clothed me in a robe of salvation, and with a garment of joy hath He decked me.*” And if thou knewest that we who have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ, and have received a garment of joy, the grace of the Holy Spirit, and that we have the sign of the cross *as a mother*² *the bridegroom, and as a bride* we will adorn ourselves with the adornment of works, and *like the earth which increaseth its flowers* the church causes them that are illumined in herself to bloom year by year, and like a sweet-smelling garden makes its seeds to sprout, that is the newly-called unto the faith; thus shall the Lord make to shine the righteousness which is the day of salvation and gladness, the rising up before all the heathen.³

Z. Thou understandest, then, and preachest the first days of the month here spoken of, as thou wilt, unto thyself?

[215] A. Since thou art even yet unbelieving, hear also what follows, and for very awe tell the truth⁴: “*Because of Sion I will not be silent, and because of Jerusalem I will not submit, until My righteousness shall go forth as light and My salvation as a flaming torch. And the heathen shall see thy righteousness, and all the people thy glory. And he shall be called by a new name by which the Lord shall name him. And thou shalt become a crown of beauty in the hand of the Lord, and a kingly diadem in the hand of thy God.*”

Z. Concerning what dost thou allege this to be said?

A. Concerning Jerusalem. For it is no longer a city of the Jews, but a city of Christians who are called by a new name. For if thou goest thither, thou wilt learn that it is

¹ Isa. lxi. 10.

² Is. lxi. 10, 11, by reading, for *μήτραν, μητέρα* [R. Harris].

³ There seems to be a lacuna here in the text.

⁴ Isa. lxii. 1.

become a city of Christ and a dwelling-place of solitaries, of virgins both men and women; and [thou wilt learn] the holy resurrection of Christ, and all kings upholding (or bringing) their glory, and all the heathen in their congregations the ornament of Him wherewith in preaching He was adorned.

Z. Then it is no more burned with fire or to be despised.

A. It has been destroyed and dishonoured for Jews; but for Christians it is a habitation and is made glorious.

Z. The prophecy says¹: "*And there shall come aliens as shepherds of thy flocks and foreigners plowmen and as vine-dressers. But ye shall be called priests of the Lord, and worshippers of God shall ye be named. The power of the Gentiles ye shall devour, and in their riches ye shall be wonderful.*" Dost see that it is to us Jews that He vouchsafes the promise of good tidings?

[216] A. This thou sayest truly, for so are the good tidings of God fulfilled which He assured when He swore to Abraham on himself, saying²: "*Blessing I will bless thee, and multiplying will multiply thy seed like the stars of heaven and as the sand on the seashore.*" "*He also swore to David and was not false to him.*" But moreover His seed does sit for ever on His throne. For aforetime it was made clear that our Lord Jesus Christ sprang from Judah, and by Him are all good promises fulfilled; and lo, it is aliens who shepherd His reasonable sheep, and foreigners who plough, working His Church as a field. But He himself along with the disciples has the priesthood, eating the power of the heathen. For "*I,*" He says in the Gospels, "*have meat to eat which ye know not of.*"³ And in the riches of the heathen He is wonderful. For look at the rhetors and philosophers and the makers (*i.e.* poets) bringing the riches of words; and withdrawing from idolatry

¹ Isa. lxi. 5.

² Gen. xxii. 17.

³ John iv. 32.

they walk in front of the word of grace. But you saw Him raising the dead, yet believed not, but have died; while the heathen have risen along with those who were dead.

Z. And what is there to boast of in the raising of the dead? Have not the magicians raised the dead, and did they not perform such signs so as to oppose Moses?

A. And because the magicians wrought signs and opposed Moses, did Moses therefore do nothing to boast of?

Z. Although Moses did work very great signs, yet God is not believed in because of signs, but because of the truth.

[217] A. And what is greater than the truth of Christ? For what magician could before ever he was born work signs and wonders?

Z. And as to Christ, what signs did He work before ever He was born?

A. He made the prophets to say concerning Himself: "*Behold a virgin shall conceive and bear a son,*" as well as ten thousand other things. But more, being still in the very womb He made John leap and rejoice in his mother's womb.¹

Z. I do not believe the Gospels.

A. Then believest thou not that He was the Son of Mary?

Z. This much, that He was born in Jerusalem itself, and I know that He was a Son of Mary.

A. And in the same Jerusalem then, Elizabeth was big with John when Christ made him to rejoice and leap. And in the very moment of his birth He drew the magi from the East to worship Him.² For no magus at birth ever made a star to appear in heaven, nor made other magi come and worship him.

Z. And canst thou then satisfy me that magi at His birth came and worshipped Him?

¹ Cp. Luke i. 44.

² Cf. Matt. ii. 1.

A. Be persuaded by the very realities, and ask why it was that Herod slew the babes in Bethlehem. And having learned the reason, assure yourself that it was because of Christ, the magi having come and said: "*Where is He who was born the King of the Jews? For we saw His star in the east, and are come to worship Him.*"¹ Wherefore also the tombs of the children are to be seen before one's eyes to this day.

[218] Z. I do not believe it was so, or else how was not Christ able to help the children and prevent their death?

A. If you would mock, put opposite the case of those children who were slain by Pharaoh "*at the time when Moses was born.*"² In their case too, surely God could have saved the children of the Jews. But if He could do so then and did not save, so here Christ, though He was able, did not save. For it was the self-same one who was longsuffering both then and now.

Z. But in Moses' case God exacted vengeance for the death of the children, and brought it upon the Egyptians.

A. Well, and if you Jews were not insensate, you would be feeling—much more than the Egyptians—anguish at the cruel destruction of Jerusalem. And, moreover, the Egyptians suffered only for one or two years, but the Jews, from Christ until now, are always and continually being tormented. They will, moreover, be so again in the future age which is to come, unless they repent.

Z. Even if I did believe in Christ, I should believe in Him as in a priest, and surely not as in God. For thyself didst say, that together with His disciples He has the priesthood.

A. Nay, I said that He is both Priest and Lord and God and Shepherd.

Z. For if He be God, He is then admitted to be Shepherd. For it is of the people He is Shepherd, as also the

¹ Matt. ii. 2.

² Acts vii. 7.

prophet says ¹: “*Thou who shepherdest Israel, look [on us], [219] Thou who leadest as it were the flock of Joseph.*”

A. The very same prophet called Him also Lord and God and Priest.

Z. Read me : where is it written ?

A. In the hundred and ninth Psalm ² he says as follows : “*The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on My right hand, till I make Thine enemies the footstool of Thy feet. A rod of power shall the Lord send thee from Sion, and thou shalt reign among thine enemies. With Thee is there for Me a beginning of the days of power unto the illumining of Thy saints. From the womb before the daystar I begat Thee. The Lord hath sworn and will not now repent Him, that Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedek.*” Now Solomon was not a priest, nor at all pleasing to God in his whole heart in his life. Nay rather he did evil before the Lord and died. How then does he remain a priest for ever ?

Z. Then was it to Christ that David said : “*Sit Thou on My right hand, till I make Thine enemies the footstool of Thy feet*” ?

A. David said, “*The Lord said,*” that is to say God, “*to my Lord,*” Christ, “*Sit Thou on My right hand, until I make, etc.*”

Z. And Christ sits on the right hand of God ?

A. So says the prophet.

Z. So, then, is Christ greater than the Blessed One ?

A. Forefend ! let it not even be hinted at.

Z. And how then sits He at His right hand ?

[220] A. As the only-begotten Son of His Father.

Z. And how is He still Priest if He sits at His right hand ?

A. Because He is not only Priest, but is God. For being God by nature He took flesh from Mary just for this reason—that having become man, and making a sacrifice in Him-

¹ Ps. lxxx, 1.

² Ps. cix. 1-4.

self for our sake, He may become a *priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek*,¹ who was not a priest *after the order of fleshly mandate*,² but was so as having been anointed by the Holy Spirit a priest for ever.

Z. And how can He who died under Pontius Pilate be a priest for ever.

A. They that are dead in their minds see His death. But the living contemplate His resurrection.

Z. And who is able to persuade me that He rose?

A. The prophet David, when he says in the Psalm :³ “*Thou wilt not leave My soul in hell, nor suffer Thy Holy One to see corruption.*”

Z. But in that case He was a man of spirit and flesh.

A. He was man according to the flesh, and God according to the spirit. About which hear what God says through the prophet Isaiah :⁴ “*Egypt hath laboured, hath grown weary, and the merchants of the Ethiops and Sabæans, men of stature, shall pass by unto Thee, and shall be Thy servants, and after Thee shall they walk bound with manacles ; and shall worship Thee and shall [221] pray to Thee. For God is in Thee, and there is no other god but Thee. Thou wast God, and we knew not, God the Saviour of Israel. They shall be ashamed and abashed, all who are opposed to Him, and shall walk in shame. Be ye renewed in Me, ye isles. For Israel hath been saved by the Lord with an everlasting salvation. They shall not be ashamed, nor abashed for ever. Thus saith the Lord, who made the heavens.*”

Z. Thou hast thyself read and avowed that Israel was saved by the Lord. Surely, then, not you, who are of the heathen?

A. He means the holy apostles by Israel. If not, how do you apply it to your own selves, when you hear the words : “*They shall not be ashamed, nor be put to shame for*

¹ Ps. cx. 4.

² Heb. vii. 16.

³ xvi. 10.

⁴ xlv. 14.

evermore" ? Do not suppose the prophet to say what is else, [when he says] that "*Israel is saved by the Lord with everlasting salvation.*" But if thou chooseth to say, "we have not been ashamed nor put to shame by losing all and being enslaved to Romans," then dare to say that our fathers obtained the prophets in falsehood.

Z. God forbid that I should pronounce the prophecies false.

A. Since Israel, then, was saved with eternal salvation, they shall not be ashamed nor put to shame for evermore. [That is] the apostles who were by nature Jews, both body and soul. For 'tis *not he that is openly circumcised that is a Jew,*¹ but whoever hath circumcision in secret, for which reason God afterwards openly censures [222] those who possess circumcision, but not in their hearts, saying: "*All the heathen are uncircumcised in the flesh, but My people in their hearts.*"²

Z. Has God, who commanded Abraham, saying: "*Let thine every male be circumcised on the eighth day,*" turned away from the circumcision ?

A. Thou dost learn the saying about [or of] the circumcision. At the same time tell me, didst thou learn unto whom God spake by the prophet the words: "*Egypt hath toiled, hath wearied, and merchants . . . Saviour of Israel*" ?³

Z. He said to Jerusalem, "*Egypt hath toiled, hath wearied . . . with manacles.*"

A. Surely he did not walk around Jerusalem, and so the rest follow after bound ?

Z. He follows after Jerusalem, who lives by her law, and who serves her continually, and worships her, and prays in her, as if actually bound unto her.

A. Is this Jerusalem also God ? For he says: "*And they shall worship Thee, and shall [223] pray. For God is in*

¹ Cf. Rom. ii. 8.

² Jer. ix. 26.

³ Cited in full as above.

Thee, and there is no other god but Thee. Thou wast God, and we knew not, God, Saviour of Israel."

Z. And to whom else, tell me?

A. To no one else than to Christ.

Z. How?

A. "*For Egypt hath toiled, and the merchants of the Ethiops.*" Because at the birth of Christ idolatry was broken down and magic arts shattered, and Sabæans, men of stature, passed over unto Him, and becoming His servants followed after Him bound all with fetters, the exalted of the earth; and they pray to Him and worship Him, and avow that God is in Him, and that there is no other God but He. For He was God, and they knew not, God of Israel, the Saviour.

Z. How is God in Him, while at the same time there is no other God but He?

A. Because of the unchangeable nature, of the identity of glory, of the immediacy of power. For because of this both Lord and God are one, because there is one will, one authority, and one power. For the Father does not plan one thing and the Son another; or the Father controul one and the Son another. However, if thou wouldst hear their whole counsels at large, read the seventieth Psalm of David,¹ with good conscience and godly fear. Perhaps, also, in your synagogue even, instead of a song which tickles the ears, you repeat this psalm.

Z. And what says this psalm about thy Christ?

A. Read, and thou wilt discover.

Z. I have read it, and know that it speaks of Solomon.

A. "*O God, give Thy judgments to the king.*" Who speaks?

Z. David prays God to be so good as to grant that his son, that is Solomon, may execute his judgments.

A. "*And Thy righteousness to the son of the king.*"

¹ ? 72nd.

Z. By the son of the king he means my son. For David was king when he prayed to God, that God Himself would give His righteousness to Solomon.

A. Go on of thyself in fear of God. "*Let the mountains receive peace for Thy people, and the little hills righteousness; to work justice unto the poor of the people, and to revive the children of the needy, and to humble the proud.*"

Z. All this he speaks concerning Solomon.

A. Let us consider what follows.

Z. Go on.

A. "*He shall stand and abide with the sun, and before the moon for generations of generations.*"

Z. His name was established with the sun; wherefore, lo, even you Christians all over the earth commemorate his name as that of a sage, and unto generations of generations abides and lasts with him the glory of his name.

A. And was His name before the moon for generations of generations?

[225] Z. Yes; His name was known even before the moon's.

A. Listen to what follows.

Z. Go on.

A. "*He shall come down like rain upon a fleece, and as showers that drop on the earth.*" *There shall flourish in His days righteousness, much peace, until the moon be ended. And He shall reign from sea unto sea, and from rivers unto the ends of the earth. Before Him the Ethiopians shall prostrate themselves, and His enemies shall lick the dust. The kings of Tarshish and of the Islands shall make presents. The kings of Arabia and Saba shall bring offerings. All the kings of the earth shall fall down before Him, and all nations shall serve Him. For He hath delivered the poor from the strong, and the needy man who had none to help him. He will have pity on the poor and needy, and will save the souls of the needy; and He will redeem their soul from usury and injustice. And precious*

is His name before them ; and He shall live, and there shall be given Him of the gold of Arabia. And they shall pray to Him at all times, and all the day long they shall bless Him. He shall be the establishing of the earth on the mountain tops. The fruit thereof shall be lifted up above Libanon, and they shall flourish in the city like the grass of the earth. His name shall be blessed for ever ; before the sun is His name continually abiding. All the princes of the earth shall be blessed in Him, all the nations shall call Him happy. Blessed [226] be the Lord God of Israel, who alone doeth wonders. And blessed is the name of His glory for ever and for ever and ever. Let the whole earth be filled with His glory. May it be so, may it be."

Z. This is admitted to be said of Christ ; but as yet Christ is not come.

A. In His advent it was fulfilled ; and if He came, whom thou dost look forward to, He would find everything fulfilled which was foretold.

Z. And of the predictions, what is fulfilled ?

A. "He reigned from sea to sea, from the rivers to the ends of the earth. Before Him the Indians shall prostrate themselves," and you His enemies shall eat the dust. And all kings of the earth shall fall down before Him, all races shall serve Him, and in Him shall be blest all the races of the earth.

Z. How did the crucifiers of Him fall down before Him ?

Z. His insults¹ were set down in writing,² and His sufferings, and death, and honour, and glory, and resurrection. Hear then David, who says :³ "Why did the nations rage, and the peoples imagine vain things ? The kings of the earth were arrayed against Me, and the rulers were gathered together against the Lord, and against His anointed."

¹ Perhaps "enemies" should be the translation.

² The Arm. = ἀναστοιχείω.

³ Ps. ii. 1, 2.

Z. How both against the Lord, and because of Him ?

A. Because God knew the good¹ and made him write what came to pass differently. And this is what was said by God through the prophet:² [227] "*Behold, I set up in Sion a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence. And whoever believeth in Him, let him not be ashamed.*"

Z. And why did He set Him up a Stone of stumbling, and not rather cause Him to be openly avowed ?

A. Why, if it had not already been told thee thus, "*Whoever believeth in Him, let him not be ashamed,*" then perhaps what was set up would be justly found fault with. But since thou wast warned beforehand, thou must blame thyself for thy want of faith. For He is the Stone which was rejected among the builders, about which the prophet says³: "*The Stone which the builders rejected, the Same is become the Headstone of the corner.*"

Z. And the Wisdom of God became a stone ?

A. The Wisdom of God has been called a Stone according to the flesh, because it took flesh from the Virgin, in order to be manifested to us in the flesh as in a temple. For this reason it was called a Stone. And the same is the Rock which Daniel⁴ interpreted, cut out of the mountain without hand, pulverizing the image of idolatry.

Z. And from what mountain was it cut ?

A. By mountain is meant the holy Virgin Mary; wherefore the Rock is said to have been cut out without hand, for the Virgin brought forth His flesh without a man. For the prophecy says: Nabuchodonoser saw a dream, and the dream departed from him, that is, he forgot it. And he called unto him seers and magi, and the wise men of

¹ The sense is obscure.

² Is. xxviii. 16; Heb. ix. 33. Notice that Isaiah xxviii. 16 is here quoted in the same form as by Paul, yet, it would seem, direct from the text of a LXX., and not through Paul's epistle nor through the Armenian Vulgate, which reproduces the LXX.

³ Ps. cxviii. 22.

⁴ ii. 45.

Babylon, and said to them, The dream hath departed from me, so now tell me the dream and its explanation. And the magi and seers declared that there was no one on the earth who could tell the king the matter, save only gods who should have no dwelling on the earth. And Nabuchodonoser commanded that all the seers and the magi and sages should be destroyed. And Daniel, having learned of the king's matter, besought him to allow him a fixed time after three days. And having been granted it by the king, he entered into his house; and he prayed to God, and set before Him the dream which the king had seen and its interpretation. And the dream was this: A great figure appeared raised aloft, and its appearance was terrible. Its head was of pure gold; its hands and breast and arms of silver; its belly and thighs of brass; its legs of iron; its feet in part of iron, and in part of potsherd. It was seen until that Rock was cut from the mountain without hand; and this smote the image upon the feet of iron and potsherd, and brake them utterly. Then were broken in pieces the potsherd and iron, and brass, and silver, and gold, and became like the chaff of the summer threshing-floor. And the violence of the wind blew them away, and their place was not found. But the Rock which smote the image became a mighty mountain, and filled the whole earth. This was the dream of the king. And Daniel interprets the dream, giving various explanations of the heterogeneous figure. And the rock is a kingdom, which shall not fail for ever. This is the kingdom of Christ, compared to a rock, because your fathers stumbled against it.

Z. Now I understand. Your Christ is compared to a stone.

A. It is always the case that obscure and dim things are known and made plain by means of parables; or hast thou not heard God saying by the prophet,¹ "I will be as [229]"

¹ Hos. v. 14.

a panther to Ephrem, and as a lion to the house of Judah"? And elsewhere,¹ "I will meet them as a bear that is hungry"? So then, if He compares to a bear or to other animals of the same kind the Godhead, will He give offence?

Z. Surely it is not true that God became a bear, but the term is used to inspire fear?

A. Just in the same way; because many were scandalized in mind at the Lord, He was called a Rock. Hear then another prophecy about the Lord in the same prophet²: "I beheld," he says, "till the thrones were placed, and the Ancient of Days sat down. His raiment was like white snow, and the hair of His head like pure wool. His throne was like a flame of fire, the wheels thereof burning fire. And a stream of fire came forth before Him, and thousands of thousands ministered unto Him, and myriads of myriads stood before Him. The court sat down, and the books were opened. I saw in a dream by night, and lo, in the clouds of heaven as it were the Son of man went forward, and came as far as the Ancient of Days, and stood before Him. And to Him was given authority, and honour, and kingship; and all peoples, races, and tongues served Him. His authority is everlasting authority which passes not away, and His kingship shall not be destroyed. My soul was affrighted within me. I am Daniel; and the vision of my head disturbed me. And I came to one that stood there, and I demanded to learn the truth about all that. And he told me the truth, and showed me the interpretation of the words. Those four beasts are four kings [that] [230] shall rise up against the earth, who shall be taken away, and the saints shall assume the kingdom of the Exalted One, and shall possess it for aeons of aeons."

Z. And who are the four kings or who the holy ones?

A. Who is the Ancient of Days? If thou knowest, say.

Z. I say God Almighty. For whom else do thousands of

¹ Hos. xiii. 8.

² Dan. vii. 9, 10, 13-18.

thousands serve, or before whom else do myriads of myriads stand, except God only?

A. Thou hast answered well. And He who came with clouds of heaven having the likeness of the Son of man, who was He?

Z. Christ.

A. And the holy ones are plainly those who have the kingdom, his disciples. And the four kings, who are they? Kings of the four regions of the world praying to be servants of those saints.

Z. But when I said Christ, I did not mean thy Christ, but him for whom we hope.

A. And again I tell thee, if he for whom thou hopest should come, he would find everything long ago seized of the truth. For reckoning together the periods of years, we have found them to agree with those of the prophet. And the heathen have been released from the yoke of idolatry, and everything else has come to pass in accord with the prophecy.

Z. Where is the time specified?

A. Daniel himself says,¹ “ *And while I was speaking and praying, telling their sins to my people Israel, pouring forth my pity before God because of the mountain of the Lord God, the Holy One,—behold the man Gabriel, whom I saw in my first dream, flying, approached unto me, as it were at the hour of the evening sacrifice, and made me understand, and spake to me, and said, Daniel, I am now come to make thee intelligent with understanding. In the beginning of thy prayers went forth an oracle; and I am come to apprise thee and tell thee; because thou art a man of desire. So then ponder on thy word, and take into consideration thy vision. Seventy hebdomads have been abridged upon thy people and on the holy city, unto the ending of sin, and sealing of illegalities, and the coming of everlasting righteousness; and unto the sealing of vision and*

¹ Dan. xi. 20-26.

prophecy, and the anointing of the holy of holies. And thou shalt know, and become apprised from the goings forth of words to give answer. And to build Jerusalem, until the anointed leader, hebdomads seven and hebdomads sixty and two. And they shall return, and courts shall be built and wall. And times shall be renewed. But after sixty and two hebdomads the anointing shall be destroyed, and judgments shall not be therein; and the city and the holiness shall be destroyed." Thou hast heard that up to the leadership of the anointed Cyrus are seven hebdomads of years, and hebdomads sixty and two, which make hebdomads sixty and nine—that is, 483 years. Read then the chronologist, and thou wilt find that from Darius, son of Arshaur, until Christ there are 483 years. For in the first year of Darius he says he saw the revelation of the dream of the prophet. And when the time comes, "anointing and judgment shall be destroyed," that is, king and judge; and more than that, "both city and holiness shall be destroyed."

[232] Z. Thou didst promise to tell me the reason for not receiving the circumcision which is from the fathers.

A. Because God did not enjoin on the fathers circumcision, He Himself said: "*Behold days shall come, said the Lord, and I will lay upon Judah a new covenant; not according to the covenant which I laid on their fathers in the day when I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt, giving my laws into their minds.*"¹ For no longer is there a law of circumcision, that their glory [be] not by shame, but in the heart.

Z. And God who commanded our fathers, saying²: "*Every male who shall not be circumcised on the eighth day shall be destroyed out of the congregation*"—does He no more desire circumcision?

A. He knoweth what is profitable. At that time accordingly He asked for the shadow, but now for the truth. For

¹ Jer. xxxi. 31, 32.

² Gen. xvii. 12.

it was not so much this that He proposed and demanded, I mean the circumcision of the flesh of uncircumcision; but He desired thereby to hint at the truth. Wherefore He blames them, saying¹: "*All the heathen are uncircumcised in the flesh, but this My people in their hearts.*" And that He does not justify circumcision is clear from this that Abraham in his uncircumcision was pleasing to God.² For it was previously that He appeared to him, and afterwards only that He gave him the law of circumcision. And³ those who were born in the desert during the period of forty years were uncircumcised.³

Z. Thou canst not prove it.

A. Thou art aware that when they were about to enter the land of reward, then according to the command of God Joshua son of Nun took stones from the rocks and with these stones he circumcised the people.

[233] Z. And forasmuch as thou knowest that God is solicitous about circumcision, why sayest thou that circumcision is naught?

A. Dost thou see that God's command is clear as to its purport? For He desired circumcision more amidst the Egyptians on the part of the children of Israel, before ever He caused them to go into Egypt, in order that the race might be manifest to all men. On the other hand He did not insist on circumcision when they were in the wilderness, because they were alone, and they had no contact with any one. But when they were once more on the eve of mixing with aliens He again commanded them to be circumcised, in order that the race might be manifest to those who lived around them. And then it was He told Joshua to take knives from rocks to circumcise them withal. And this was no insignificant thing, but full of mystery. For Christ is the Rock wherewith we are circumcised, not in the flesh of uncircumcision, but in the im-

¹ Jer. ix. 26.

² Cf. Rom. iv. 10.

³ Josh. v. 5.

purity of the heart. And in fact if this was not done as a mystery, then why were they circumcised not with a knife, but with stones.

Z. In order to show the greatness of God, if they could be circumcised even with stones.

A. Much more was it shown, if with a bare and single word they had been circumcised, without any material thing. And that thou mayest know that circumcision does not justify, Noe was a just and pious man without circumcision, and Enoch was translated though uncircumcised.

Z. And how canst thou prove that they were uncircumcised?

A. Because circumcision only began with Abraham. For to him first and foremost did God give the commandment to be circumcised, and to his seed.

[234] Z. Give me a satisfactory reason why you also abstain from performing sacrifices, when the just men of old sacrificed to God. Thou surely canst not allege that this only began with Abraham? For the Scriptures plainly say that Abel, the last born of Adam, sacrificed, and that his sacrifice was acceptable because it was a sacrifice of animals.

A. Yes, we are well aware that all the saints previous to the advent of Christ sacrificed. But after Christ [the sacrifice] of irrational animals ceased, and that which is by means of the Holy Spirit increased, for God openly proclaimed¹: "*I eat not the flesh of oxen, nor drink the blood of goats. Sacrifice to God the sacrifice of praise.*" And elsewhere He says²: "*The lifting up of My hands, the evening sacrifice.*" And³: "*Behold the days are coming, saith the Lord, and I will lay on the house of Judah a new covenant. Not according to the covenant which I laid on their fathers in the day when I took them by the hand to bring them out of the*

¹ Ps. l. 13, 14.

² Ps. cxli. 2.

³ Jer. xxxi. 31-33.

land of Egypt. I have given My laws in their hearts, and in their minds will I write them."

Z. Thou hast convinced me from all points of view that our fathers acted impiously in crucifying Christ. For it has appeared from what thou hast said that He was the expectation, and the Jews forfeited their hope. What therefore must I do that I may be saved?

A. Repent and be baptized unto the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost, that thou too mayest hearken unto David's words: ¹ "*Blessed are they whose transgressions have been remitted and whose sins have been hidden.*"

F. C. CONYBEARE,

¹ Ps xxxii. 1,

A VOLUNTARY HUMILITY.

“A voluntary humility”—*Col. ii. 18.*

THESE words recall to us vast and cloudy speculations which during the second century threatened to drown and even to quench the glory of the Christian gospel. They have long ceased to be credible. We look back upon them with astonishment. It is difficult for us to understand that men of genius should have given their strength to constructing them. But the intellectual and moral conditions from which they all originated exist among ourselves. Man remains the same, though his speculations about God and the universe change from age to age.

Among the Colossian Christians, as we can see in this Epistle, there were teachers who anticipated in a rudimentary way that great movement of religious and philosophical thought which sixty years later was called Gnosticism. At Colossæ they blended into one perilous and pernicious system two distinct and at first sight incoherent elements. On the one hand, they insisted on the permanent obligation and on the religious value of the outward institutions of Judaism. They maintained that Christian men were bound to keep the Sabbath and the festivals of the Mosaic law, and they went even beyond the demands of the Mosaic law in their precepts concerning abstinence from different kinds of food and drink which, as they supposed, were injurious to the higher life of the soul. On the other hand, they adventured on speculations concerning God and His relations to the world and the human race which were wholly alien from the whole substance of the historic Jewish faith. As I have said, they anticipated in a rudimentary way the elaborate theories of Gnosticism. It is to this side of their teaching that Paul is referring when he warns the Colossian Church against being robbed

of the great prize of their Christian calling—present restoration to God and eternal redemption—by a voluntary humility and worshipping of angels.

There are traces of Gnostic tendencies among the Jews of the first century and the false teachers at Colossæ were Jews who were influenced by these tendencies. Gnosticism asks: How is it possible to conceive of God, the Eternal God, the Holy God, as the Author and Creator of the world as we know it, and of men as we know them? The world is a world of matter, God is a Spirit: the distance between the world and God is infinite. In the world there is pain, sorrow, death; God is infinitely good, and how can the world have come from Him? Men, as we know them, are often selfish, intemperate, sensual, unjust, cruel; even in the best men there is sin: how is it possible to imagine that men were created by God who is glorious in His holiness?

These questions were agitating the Jewish mind before this Epistle was written; and there were Jews who supposed that they had discovered the answer to them in the hints and suggestions contained in the Old Testament about the existence of angels.

I cannot attempt to give an exact outline of their theory, which indeed only gradually assumed definiteness, and which received a great variety of forms; but their fundamental principle may be stated in a very few words. They supposed that the Eternal God gave existence to a glorious being, or to several glorious beings, inferior to Himself, but possessing great and wonderful power; that this being, or these beings, originated others who were also glorious and who also possessed great powers, but who were a degree lower both in glory and power; that these again originated other beings; that, as the movement went on, each new order had less of the life and light of God than the order from which it came, and that at last there came into exist-

ence a being who was so far remote from the transcendent perfection of God, that it was possible for him to handle matter and to give form to a world like this and to a race like our own.

The root of the whole position, you see, is the assumption that God is too holy, too great, too good, to have any direct and immediate relation either to the world or to men. Between Him and us, between Him and the world, there is an infinite distance: a chasm of angelic beings, rank below rank, extends over the immense and awful interval,—thrones, dominations, virtues, powers; and we are in immediate contact with the lowest of these angelic orders. That was the form which the Gnostic theory held among the Jews.

But if God is too great for Him to have any direct relation to us, He must be too great for us to have any direct relation to Him. If He cannot approach us, we cannot approach Him. And so when the Colossian Christians who had received this false teaching looked up to God, they saw rising above them, in ascending greatness and splendour, rank above rank of angelic powers,—spiritual agencies intermediate between God and man, between man and God: the highest of these glorious beings were too high for the thought of common men to reach, for the vision of common men to gaze upon; and God, the eternal God, was infinitely higher still. God they could not reach. They revered and worshipped angels. They confessed that they were unequal to the blessedness of standing in the immediate presence of the Supreme. This is what Paul calls “*a voluntary humility*,”—a wilful refusal of the dignity which God has conferred upon us in Christ.

The men who insisted that there can be no immediate relation between the Eternal and the world, and who constructed gigantic systems of speculation to show how the awful interval between the Eternal and the created uni-

verse was bridged over, claimed to be in possession of the true *Gnosis*—the real knowledge of things. Other Christians were *believers*: they were the men who *knew*. Paul in this Epistle sets the true knowledge—the true *Gnosis*—over against the false. He teaches that all things were created in Christ, in heaven, and on earth,—in Christ, the Eternal Son of God, who shares the eternal life and glory of the Father, and is one with Him, of the same substance,—to use the technical term of a later age; and in Christ *we* were created. By sin we had become alienated from our true life—the life of God in Christ—and had provoked the displeasure and condemnation of the Eternal; but Christ in His death for the sin of the world made peace—and through Him we recover the greatness for which we were created. To refuse immediate access to God in Christ, to despair of the immediate knowledge of God through Christ, is a voluntary, a wilful humility.

And now, dismissing these vanished forms of speculation, let us consider some of the tendencies among ourselves which have the same root.

There are some men who say, The universe is great and wonderful, and human patience and genius have made brilliant discoveries concerning its laws and its history; but by the very constitution of our minds we cannot pass beyond it: of God, from whom it came, we can know nothing. That is what Paul would call a wilful or voluntary humility,—an abdication of your regal greatness.

You find in visible and material things an intelligible order; an order, I mean, which you can understand: it answers to your own thought; you can construct a theory of it by observation and experiment; and your theory you call Science. But when I say that a painting is intelligible to me, I mean that I can discover the thought of the artist. I can see—imperfectly, perhaps, but still I can see what was in his mind and purpose when he painted it. If I say

that a building is intelligible to me, if I can construct a theory of it, I mean that I have learned, more or less completely, the principles on which the architect constructed it; I have grasped his thought concerning the proportions of it, concerning the purposes of its various parts. If I say that a poem is intelligible to me, I mean that there is a real relation between my mind and the mind of the poet; that in reading it I have not my own arbitrary thoughts about it, but his thoughts. In the painting the mind of the artist meets my mind. Unless I shared a common intellectual life with the artist, his painting would be unintelligible to me. And wherever the visible universe is intelligible to me, the mind of the Creator of the universe meets my mind, and unless I shared a common intellectual life with the Creator, His creation would be unintelligible to me.

This is Paul's doctrine. The universe was created in and through Christ. You also were created in and through Christ. The light of your intellectual life is kindled by the glorious fires of His intellectual life; therefore His creation is in part intelligible to you. Your intellectual life might decline, its light be almost extinguished: then the creation would cease to be intelligible to you; you could not find any order in it; the thought of its Creator would be beyond your reach. But while you retain the intellectual life with which you were created in Christ, your thought can reach His thought.

Let us take another example of voluntary, wilful humility. There are some men who say, Duty is clear to us. We see that we ought to be just, truthful, kindly, industrious, temperate. But we can see nothing more. About God we can discover nothing. He is beyond our reach.

Is that so? *Duty* is a very wonderful word. The word *Ought*, as soon as you try to see what it means, will lead you into regions of infinite mystery. What is the experience that you represent, when you say that you "ought" to

be kindly and just, for example, to the people about you? *Ought!* Does it mean simply that they have claims on you which you ought to fulfil by justice and kindness? That your conduct is an affair between you and them, and between you and them only?

They have claims on you. Yes, but why *ought* you to fulfil them? Where is the obligation rooted? By what authority is it enforced? *Claims*—how do you distinguish between those of their demands which you *ought* to meet, and those which you are at liberty to disregard? What constitutes the difference? What is that *ought* which is imperative in the one description of demands and silent in the other?

You say that your conduct is an affair between you and them—between you and them only: is it so? Can they release you from the obligation to be just to them, from the obligation to be kind to them? *They* cannot do it. There is some mysterious authority above you both; and in that august word *Ought* it speaks with regal power: beyond it there is no appeal: that word is final.

Ought: you hear it in your most secret heart; it binds—it forbids secret acts, secret passions, secret thoughts. It is above you. It accepts no bribes. It can be dethroned by no force. You may refuse to listen. It may become silent: but the silence is awful; then your doom begins. It has to be reckoned with. You know that it has to be reckoned with. What—what is this mysterious power?

Paul's answer is, You were created in Christ, the Eternal Son of the Eternal God: and in that word *Ought* the will of Christ is asserted concerning your conduct. While your moral life remains you share something of His moral life. Your moral life may be corrupted, as your intellectual life may be impaired: your moral judgments may be false, as your intellectual conclusions may be false. But as long as the moral life is unextinguished, there will be the sense,

dim and faint perhaps, but most real, of an Authority above you, which you are bound to obey. Accept it with joy. This is your glory—that you may fulfil the thought of the Eternal, that the Eternal cares for your fulfilment of His thought. Have the courage to ask Him to make His thought clearer. Trust Him for strength to enable you to fulfil it. An unconscious law—this is hard to obey: recognise through conscience the voice of the Living God, and life will receive new vigour, new hope, new joy.

II.

“A voluntary humility.” Let us look at some other examples of it.

There are Churches which encourage the penitent and sorrowful soul, conscious of its sins and of its weakness, to invoke the mediation and intercession of angels and of saints and of the mother of our Lord. It seems a less arduous effort of the soul to appeal to them than to appeal at once to the Supreme.

And in these same Churches a system of mediation of another kind is created between God and man. Men are invited to confess their sins to a priest, and the priest is declared to have authority to absolve from sin. To confess to a priest seems less arduous than to confess to God Himself. The priest is near: he can be seen; his voice can be heard. He himself has known the power of temptation and the trouble of a conscience ill at ease. To find God, there seems an awful distance to travel; and His transcendent holiness is also awful. How can a sinful man draw near to those eternal and glorious fires? Is it not more becoming to shrink from Him in the hour of our weakness—to speak to a man like ourselves instead of to Him? And may we not have fuller comfort in listening to an absolution, when it comes from human lips authorised

to speak for Him, than in waiting in awe and fear to listen to Himself while He assures us of His pardon? How can we hope that *He* will speak to us?

And the grace of God—the life and power that He gives to man—is there not something that transcends human strength in receiving them direct from Himself? If His appointed ministers consecrate the bread and the wine, and so make them the vehicle of spiritual life and power, is there not something in this more suited to our low estate?

Paul would have made short work with all these pleas, and would have said that in every one of them there was a voluntary, a wilful humility, a rejection of the fulness of the mercy and grace which God has made ours in Christ. Angels—saints—Mother of Christ, as intercessors!—You, too, were created in Christ: you are one with Him: in His Sonship you are sons: in His access to God you have access to the Father. You yourselves are to speak to God in Christ's name, because of the union between you and Him; and to decline to do it is a voluntary, a wilful refusal of the redemption and the reconciliation to God which Christ has accomplished for you by His Incarnation, Death, and Resurrection.

Priests to absolve! In Christ's death you died. He bore your sins in His own body upon the tree. You have redemption through His blood, even the forgiveness of sins. In Christ, as far as the east is from the west, so far has God removed your transgressions from you. Have the courage to accept your redemption—to thank God for it. Christ is not far away: He has descended for you to depths deeper than any into which you have ever sunk, into a darkness which forced from His lips the appalling cry, "My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?" He is near to you still,—nearer than the priest: for you were created in Christ, not in the priest; the very root of your being is

in Him. He, and only He, is the way to the Father. It is a voluntary humility which confesses to another instead of to Him, and which receives absolution from another instead of from Him.

Priests to consecrate sacraments that they may be vehicles of grace! Is Christ absent from a company gathered together in His name unless a priest is there? I repeat, they are created in Christ; they live in His life; they are one with Him, as the branches are one with the vine. When they come together, they realize their union with each other in their common union with Him. As from His hands—from the hands of the invisible Christ—they received the bread: when He has blessed it, it needs no other blessing. As from His hands—the hands of the invisible Christ—they receive the cup: when He has consecrated it, it needs no other consecration.

It is a voluntary, wilful humility, ungracious, ungrateful, unbelieving, which refuses to believe that we may confess our sins to Him who died for them; and that we may receive direct from Him in whom we too have access to God, the life and the power which sustain Christian righteousness and joy.

R. W. DALE.

INDEX.

	PAGE
Rev. Joseph Agar Beet, D.D.	
Christian Perfection :	
I. The Word "Perfect" in the New Testament	30
II. Other New Testament Teaching	134
III. The Teaching of Wesley	211
E. N. Bennett, M.A.	
The "Priest of Penitence"	73
Rev. Prof. W. H. Bennett, M.A.	
Some Recent Old Testament Literature	234
Rev. A. A. Burd, M.A.	
The Outside and the Inside of the Cup: Note on St. Luke xi. 39-41	373
Right Rev. G. A. Chadwick, D.D., Lord Bishop of Derry and Raphoe.	
"The Mind of the Master"	1
Rev. Prof. T. K. Cheyne, D.D.	
Notes on Obscure Passages of the Prophets	41
Prof. Hommel on Arphaxad	145
The Book of Job and its Latest Commentator	401
F. C. Conybeare, M.A.	
A New Second-Century Christian Dialogue	300, 443
The Late Rev. R. W. Dale, D.D., LL.D.	
The Syro-Phœnician Woman	365
A Voluntary Humility	464
Rev. Prof. Marcus Dods, D.D.	
Survey of Literature on the New Testament	148
Rev. A. M. Fairbairn, D.D., LL.D.	
Christ's Attitude to His Own Death	16, 105
Rev. Prof. R. A. Falconer, D.D.	
The Prologue to the Gospel of John	222
Rev. Prof. G. G. Findlay, M.A.	
St. John's "Last Hour"	241

	PAGE
Prof. J. Rendel Harris, M.A.	
Mr. Charles' Apocalypse of Baruch	255
W. R. Inge, M.A.	
The Threefold Cord	128
Rev. Prof. E. König, D.D.	
The Linguistic History of the Old Testament, and Maurice Vernes' Dating of the Documents	59
Rev. G. Margoliouth, M.A.	
Moses at the Battle of Rephidim	119
Rev. G. Matheson, M.A., D.D., F.R.S.E.	
St. John's View of the Sabbath Rest	51
Liberty of the Tree of Life	96
The Christian Promise of Empire	184
The Lamb on the Throne	265
The Wrath of the Lamb	339
The Place of the Cross in the World	416
Rev. J. B. Mayor, M.A., Litt. D.	
Authenticity of the Epistle of St. James Defended against Harnack and Spitta	321
Rev. Prof. Th. Nöldeke, D.D.	
The Original Hebrew of a Portion of Ecclesiastics	347
Rev. Prof. James Orr, D.D.	
Israel in Egypt and the Exodus: with reference to Prof. Flinders Petrie's Recent Discovery	161
Prof. W. M. Ramsay, D.C.L., LL.D.	
On Dr. Schürer's Reply	69
Pauline Chronology	201
The Census of Quirinius	274, 425
Rev. Prof. A. Roberts, D.D.	
On the Knowledge of a Future State possessed by the Ancient Hebrews	377
Rev. Prof. J. A. Robinson, D.D.	
Three Notes on the Gospel according to the Hebrews	194
Rev. D. M. Ross, M.A.	
Professor Drummond's Religious Teaching	390
Rev. James Stalker, D.D.	
Henry Drummond	286
Rev. H. Clay Trumbull, D.D.	
God's Ensign at Rephidim	297

Rev. J. H. Wilkinson, M.A.

PAGE

Note on the Meaning of the Word *αἰώνιος* 78

A Criticism of Dr. Hatch's "Essays in Biblical Greek," by
 Dr. Hort (A Fragment) 81, 178
 Was St. Paul Married? 436

INDEX TO TEXTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
Genesis i. 9	91	Psalms ii. 7	317
i. 26	303	xv. 7	445
ii. 2	92	xix. 7	327
ii. 9	96	xxii. 17	314
ii. 24	308	xxxiii. 6	304
iv. 3	93	xl. 7	443
vi. 9	32	lv. 4	407
viii. 21	93	lxxx. 1	450
xi. 13	62	lxxxi. 8-10	302
xviii. 17	306	civ. 24	305
xix. 24	306	cix. 1-4	450
xxii. 17	447	cx. 4	451
xxlix. 10	93	cxviii. 16	126
xxlix. 10	316	cxli. 2	462
xxlix. 24	120	Ecclesiastes v. 14	61
Exodus i. 16	163	Isaiah iii. 10	95
xii. 40	172	vi. 4	198
xv. 1	308	vii. 10	311
xvii. 8-13	119	vii. 10-17	95
xvii. 11	126	vii. 14	311
xxiii. 14	62	x. 4	50
xl. 29	91	xi. 1	194
Numbers ix. 18	91	xi. 11	46
xi. 4-6	388	xix. 21	319
Deuteronomy vi. 4	303	xxviii. 16	456
xxi. 23	315	xxix. 13	93
xxviii. 30	46	xlii. 1-4	178
xxviii. 66	313	xliv. 6	302
xxxii. 34	93	liii. 1-3	313
Joshua v. 5	461	lxi. 1	443
1 Samuel xvi.	64	lxi. 9	445
xxii. 7	65	lxii. 1	446
2 Samuel iii. 30	66	lxv. 15, 16	320
1 Kings ii. 39	62	lxv. 21	47
viii. 61	32	lxvi. 20	49
ix. 7	91	lxvi. 24	80
xi. 24	64	Jeremiah ii. 18	318
xii. 6	64	iii. 17	179
xvii. 27	63	ix. 26	452
2 Kings viii. 6	66	xvii. 8	64
xv. 29	65	xxi. 2-7	68
1 Chronicles ii. 12	64	xxx. 5	48
v. 6	65	xxxi. 31, 32	460
xxv. 8	32	lii. 31	125
2 Chronicles xxxvi. 6-13	68	Ezekiel xiv. 8	91
Ezra x. 28	49	xvi. 3	312
Psalms ii. 1	455	xl. 2	63

	PAGE		PAGE
Daniel vii. 9, 10.	458	Luke ix. 23	6
xi. 20-26	459	xi. 39-41	373
Hosea v. 14	457	xiii. 33	16
vi. 7-11	47	xiv. 27	6
xiii. 8	458	xix. 29	17
xiv. .	44	xix. 40	17
Joel iii. 17	47	xix. 43	27
Amos i. 3	63	xx. 9-16	20
i. 6	65	xxii. 8	28
v. 26	42	xxii. 15	27
ix. 8-15	46	xxii. 39	114
Micah vi. 6	94	xxii. 53	106
vii. 14	46	xxiii. 28-31	27
Haggai i. 5.	61	Jchn i. 1	303
Zechariah ii. 4	125	iv. 32	447
viii. 9	61	iv. 34	35
Matthew ii. 2	449	vii. 38	141
iv. 21	38	viii. 25	1
v. 45	33	xii. 14	17
v. 48	135	xvii. 23	33
x. 38	6	xix. 28	33
xii. 6	20	Acts vii. 7	449
xiii. 55	316	xx. 24	33
xv. 21-28	365	xxii. 20	440
xvi. 18	3	Romans ii. 8	452
xvi. 20	17	iv. 10	461
xvi. 21	15	vi. 11	136
xvi. 24	6	x. 4	30
xviii. 17	3	1 Corinthians i. 10	38
xix. 21	33	ii. 6	33
xxi. 1	17	ii. 6	39
xxi. 12	18	xiv. 20	31
xxi. 18-22	17	xv. 36	411
xxi. 33-41	20	xvi. 3	13
xxi. 42-44	21	2 Corinthians vii. 1	143
xxii. 2-10	21	viii. 6	35
xxii. 31-32	383	Galatians ii. 20	5
xxii. 37-40	134	iii. 3.	34
xxiii. 34-39	21	v. 16	141
xxiii. 38	27	Ephesians i. 19	140
xxv. 35-40	22	iv. 13, 14	31
xxvi. 6-13	22	Philippians i. 6	35
xxvi. 36	114	iii. 12	34
xxvi. 61	20	Colossians i. 28	34
xxvii. 40	20	ii. 18	464
Mark i. 19	38	Hebrews v. 12-14	31
ii. 28	20	vii. 16	451
viii. 34	5	ix. 1-10	379
x. 21	5	xi. 6	35
xi. 1	17	James ii. 22	35
xii. 1-9	20	1 Peter i. 9	31
xiii. 31	23	1 John ii. 18-27.	242
xiv. 3-9	23	Revelations i. 10	51
xiv. 32	114	ii. 7	96
Luke i. 44	448	iii. 21	184
ii. 1-2	274	v.	265
ii. 43	33	vi.	265
ii. 52	305	xiii. 8	416
vi. 40	38	xxii. 14	97

UCSB LIBRARY

X-18421

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



A 000 456 965 3

